DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 447 SP 027 725

AUTHOR Greene, Maxine; And Others
TITLE The Master Teacher Concept: Five Perspectives. Report No. 9053.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 94p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Inservice Teacher Education; *Master Teachers; Peer Relationship; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Role; Teaching (Occupation); Teaching Conditions; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This set of papers presents five perspectives on the master teacher concept, each with a different orientation and set of assumptions guiding it: (1) "A Philosophic Look at 'Merit' and 'Mastery' in Teaching" (Maxine Greene); (2) "The School as a Workplace and the Master Teacher Concept" (Gary A. Griffin); (3) "Effective Teaching and the Concept of Master Teacher" (Walter Doyle); (4) "The Master Teacher as Curriculum Leader" (M. Frances Klein); and (5) "The Master Teacher Concept: Implications for Teacher Education" (Karen Kepler Zumwalt). (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270447

THE MASTER TEACHER CONCEPT: FIVE PERSPECTIVES

Maxine Greene
Gary A. Griffin
Walter Doyle
M. Frances Klein
Karen Kepler Zumwalt

Report No. 9053

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bauer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

To order additional copies of this report or a catalog of publications, contact Communication Services, Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Education Annex 3.203, Austin, Texas 78712.

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

THE MASTER TEACHER CONCEPT: FIVE PERSPECTIVES

Maxine Greene
Gary A. Griffin
Walter Doyle
M. Frances Klein
Karen Kepler Zumwalt

Report No. 9053

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director

April 1984

Table of Contents

Preface v

A PHILOSOPHIC LOOK AT "MERIT" AND "MASTERY" IN TEACHING 1
Maxine Greene

THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE AND THE MASTER TEACHER CONCEPT. 15
Gary A. Griffin

EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND THE CONCEPT OF MASTER TEACHER. 49
Walter Doyle

THE MASTER TEACHER AS CURRICULUM LEADER 61
M. Frances Klein

THE MASTER TEACHER CONCEPT: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION. 77
Karen Kepler Zumwalt

Preface

As American education moves into the next decades, it is sharply apparent that new ways of thinking about what teachers do and how they are rewarded are of central importance. The reduced status of teachers in the society, partly a consequence of shifting values and priorities and partly due to a perceived decline in teacher quality, has caused a number of proposals to emerge or re-emerge as ways of treating the problem.

Among the propositions for change in regard to the roles, responsibilities, and reward systems for teachers is the master teacher concept. As is often the case in educational matters, this concept is open to several interpretations. Most often, however, the master teacher is believed to be someone who is somehow superior to other teachers and, because of that superiority, is awarded higher compensation than that received by peers.

The master teacher idea has received considerable attention from policy makers, practicing educators, and the public at large. This set of papers adds to that body of attention. Five perspectives on the master teacher concept are presented, each with a different orientation and set of assumptions guiding it. The five papers demonstrate the concern held by members of the research community as they interact with the world of practice. They illustrate, in differing ways, the consequences of "seeing" the same phenomenon through different lenses. And, they also illustrate the power that scholarship has as an interpretive activity.

The master teacher concept is a reality in many parts of these United States. it is hoped that this set of papers will assist in bringing greater clarity to ongoing programs and to emerging ones.

Gary A. Griffin

A PHILOSOPHIC LOOK AT "MERIT" AND "MASTERY" IN TEACHING

Maxine Greene

Teachers College

Columbia University

Given the technical ethos of our time, the concern with cost-benefit considerations, the orientation to "results," it is not surprising that there should be a preoccupation with the measurable and the observable where teaching is concerned. What is described as "excellence" today is defined in terms of measurable achievements: and publics as well as policy-makers are, in response, prone to reduce concepts of "merit" and "mastery" to notions of technical effectiveness in the securing of "excellence." To be a master teacher, it is generally believed, is to manage a classroom in such a way that students perform assigned tasks more effectively than might have been expected, attain desired competencies more rapidly and efficiently, and do better on achievement tests. All this is to be accounted for by identifying a set of specific behaviors on the part of the teacher: techniques of diagramming, explaining, summarizing; spending sufficient "time on task;" defining instructional objectives; maintaining order and good "discipline." The concept of merit (often used as an adjective today) is used to refer to a level of proficiency in doing what is assumed to be required or to an observable capacity for contributing to those systems geared to maximizing skills. In both cases, value judgments are normally excluded. To weight things in terms of good and bad, right and wrong, it is thought, is to move outside the domain of the measurable. Practicing teachers, however, tend not to be convinced that value judgments or what they consider "biases" can be excluded; and this may account for the minimal support they give to ideas like master teacher and merit pay.

Looking from another vantage point, we might well make a distinction between mastery and merit; since, at first glance, merit does seem to be a value term, related to such notions as desert and moral worth. Mastery, at first glance, does appear to refer to a type or quality of capacity or craftsmanship that can be recognized and evaluated once it is displayed. Whether or not something or someone possesses merit seems to depend upon a process of appraisal, which may or may not be governed by explicit norms. One can argue that an individual (or individual action) possesses merit. One can give one's reasons relevance by referring to agreed-upon principles. One cannot, however, prove that a person or his/her conduct is meritorious. On the other hand, it would appear that one can demonstrate that someone has achieved mastery.

Be that as it may, I am going to argue for the interconnectedness of merit and mastery, but on grounds other than those taken for granted by persons preoccupied with the mastery of skills. I shall assume that both concepts refer to ways of acting or ways of being that are subject to appraisal, that both only become meaningful in the light of what is prized in particular contexts. Moreover, I shall make the point that merit is in many senses a function of mastery, and that mastery without merit may be little more than a set of engineering skills, a means of effecting technical controls. Also, it should be made clear that the very term "mastery" evokes a series of male images reaching back in time through the history of crafts, the guild system, and into the enclosures of classical Greek sculptors. Techne, authority, superiority, control: all may survive as suppressed metaphors, and it is important to hold them in mind as we try to reconceive the concept and indicate its relevance today.

Fundamental to my argument is a distinction that must be made between training and teaching. The notions of mastery and merit today are so closely linked to measurable achievement on the part of students that they seem to have far more to do with training than with teaching. An expert trainer, like a ballet master or an efficient drill sergeant, is fundamentally concerned about the inculcation of "rotes" or basic skills; and it is not difficult to connect certain sequences of, say, ballet master behavior with student attainment of certain proficiencies or skills. Granting the fact that early ballet training represents an extreme case, I choose to find an analogy in it to make my point. The student dancer, somewhat like the child being introduced to multiplication tables, is put through a series of exercises that he/she is supposed to master in precisely prescribed ways. He/she is not asked to think about them or to take a personal approach to them. The idea is to build them into his/her habit structure, not to vary or elaborate on them in any idiosyncratic way. The ballet master is an embodiment of authority--the authority of his subject matter, namely dance. He comes out of an is loyal to an old tradition; and his objective is to train his students in such a fashion that they come to know certain positions so well that they will not have to think about them, attain certain kinds of strength and flexibility requiring continuing practice if they are to be maintained.

Now it is true that, for a selected few, that ballet master may at some point transform himself from one engaged primarily in training to a person involved with teaching. This means that he may (when people are sufficiently schooled) begin communicating modes of know-how or ways of proceeding in a manner that provokes students to make their own use of what they have come to know. Moving from drilling to empowering, as it were, the

ballet master's distinctive contributions to student attainment will become more and more difficult to identify; his mastery can no longer be measured in terms of objectives that are achieved. When individual dancers begin (on their own initiatives) to try out spiral movements, say, to explore new rhythms, to distribute their weight in a style never attempted before, they go beyond what they have been trained to do, beyond an preconceived objective the ballet master may have defined for himself. (He may have wished to witness such virtuosity, hoped that his work would release such creativity; but there is no way in which he could have specified what gifted dancers would achieve once they began trying out what they had learned on their own.) This, of course, is the point at which dancers begin taking their own risks, correcting their own errors, thinking about what they are doing, and taking responsibility for what they achieve. It is the point at which, in Gilbert Ryle's terms (1967, pp. 117-118), they begin teaching themselves and truly beginning to learn.

We might say that the ballet master, working as teacher with individual dancers, releases them to make use of what Howard Gardner calls their "bodily intelligence" (1983, p. 220) in unpredictable ways. Without a grasp of the foundations, the dancers would be unable to create themselves as dancers within their particular dance community. Without a teacher personally engaged with them, eager to help them realize their potentials, they would be unlikely to show what Vernon Howard calls their "competency, proficiency, and mastery...along with understanding and appreciation a 'attainments'..." (1982, p. 181). What this suggests is that the teacher has somehow developed the capacity to communicate not only the techniques of movement and control of movement, but a commitment, a quality of attention that (when incarnated by the student in his/her own fashion) allow the

student to move beyond what has been taught. And it must be added that the teacher, authentically intending to let the younger person move on, must care for that person, in the sense of being interested in his/her growth and being eager to free him/her from both protection and control.

Now it is clear enough that the distinction between training and teaching need not be and ordinarily is not so evident in schoolrooms as it is (and perhaps must be) in the ballet studio. Too much emphasis upon identifiable sequences of "effective" teaching behavior, however, may well increase the likelihood of an either/or where training and teaching are concerned. In any event, to think of teaching is to think of deliberate or intentional action on the part of someone committed to helping another act in an informed way upon his/her own initiatives, to pursue his/her own possibilities within a given domain. It is, in part, a matter of enabling another to act mindfully in the space of his/her lived world; since to act on one's own initiative without background of meanings against which new experiences can be projected would be to move aimlessly and blindly through an inchoate jumble of incidents and things. To act mindfully is to have a sense of purpose, to be interested and concerned and attentive. "Mind," wrote John Dewey, "is care in the sense of solicitude, anxiety, as well as of active looking after things that need to be tended...Mind is primarily a verb. It denotes all the ways in which we deal consciously and expressly with the situations in which we find outselves" (1934, p. 263). This suggests that significant teaching, the kind of teaching that fosters "good habits of thinking," that provides persons to take cognitive action with respect to the vague or the perplexing or the unresolved, culminates in lived situations. Not only does it enable the learner to pose questions and respond to them, to look through increasingly diverse perspectives, to fund

increasingly diversified meanings. It should inform his/her practical undertakings, as it reduces distancing and lack of care.

Crucial to the encounter that is teaching is the capacity for mutuality and regard. The teacher must be able to perceive the student as self-determining to some degree, capable of judgment and of choice. Israel Scheffler has written that teaching "may be characterized as an activity aimed at the achievement of learning and practiced in such a manner as to respect the student's intellectual integrity and capacity for independent judgment" (1983, p. 67). He sees the teaching activity as "goal-oriented... rather than a distinctively patterned sequence of behavioral steps executed by the teacher." Since teaching involves, as John Passmore says (1980, p. 23), a "triadic relation" in that someone is teaching something to somebody, there must be on the part of the teacher the kind of engagement with subject matter that entails not merely a commitment to it, but clarity about what needs to be made explicit when it comes to learning certain things. Surely, the teacher must be able to hold in mind what might be appropriate for different pupils and for pupils at different stages of conceptual development. To be able to highlight and share particular meanings, to make relevant concepts accessible, to display contact points and continuities: all this demands the sense, on the part of the teacher, of being--as R. S. Peters puts it--"inside of a form of thought and awareness" (1978, p. 38). It demands not only the ability to communicate how it means when one articulates experience in the language of history or orders a life situation through the use of a symbol system like imaginative literature. There must be a contagious desire to move freely within such a language, to attend to new dimensions of experience through attentiveness to such symbols; and

there must be an ability to suggest (often indirectly) what it might enable a learner to see or to say or to feel.

Only such a teacher is likely to make possible what Michael Polanyi called "indwelling," the use of tacit powers to grasp the unspecifiable (1958, p. 31). Only such a teacher is likely to communicate the "intellectual passions" linked to the articular framework of the culture. Polanyi wrote of the passion that animates the student willing to cope with the difficulties of physics, for instance, gratified when the student finally feels he/she understands it and perpetuated by the sense of joy that often accompanies masters, when the student really moves beyond where he/she has been to a place where he/she aspires to be (1964, p. 173). Polanyi, too, conscious of the importance of the existential dimension of learning, the "personal knowledge" that it must in time become, offers insights that can be joined to others who think of teaching as a way of launching persons into discovery, provoking them to move beyond themselves. Polanyi, Dewey, Peters, Hannah Arendt, and numerous others come together in their recognition that discoveries of this kind, initiative of this kind are what lead to the affirmation and renewal of a "framework," a "conversation," a "public sphere," a "common world."

For all, there is a concern for the student as a moral agent, a "center of consciousness," as well as what Hannah Arendt called a "newcomer" (1958, p. 177). For all, as well, there is a concern for the role of communication or critical dialogue with the student, a giving of reasons, a disclosure of the thinking self. For all, there is an interest in what may feed into further learning and keep the way open for questioning, for what Alfred North Whitehead called the "active utilization of well-understood principles" (1949, p. 48). The teacher is expected to empower learners to

put such principles to use as they turn towards the wider culture, the plurality of human beings, the lived world.

It would appear that a teacher so engaged must have the capacity and the curiosity to attend to what students tell about their lives and their biographies, indeed their social realities. I say this because, if teaching is to characterized as Scheffler characterizes it, and if learning is to involve not only intellectual passion but what Thomas Green calls "the grasp of truth...and, therefore, the removal of ignorance" (1971, p. 29), students must be imaginatively and conceptually <u>located</u> by the teacher, socially as well as psychologically. If the goal of the teacher is, in part, to enable them to react upon and develop diverse perspectives on their existential situations, what Dewey called the environment must be taken into account. By that he meant all the things that "promote or hinder, stimulate or inhibit" human beings living in the world. He did not mean only the world of isolated objects or the visible facts in the immediate content. He meant, as well, what was beyond reach, what was not yet comprehended, not yet learned.

If students are to learn more than the terminology they need to respond to test questions, if they are consciously to attempt "the grasp of truth," their everyday experiences must be taken into account in their diversity and their limitations. Those experiences--in families, peer relations, social institutions, with work and media and popular culture are the stuff of the series of situations in which they live and of which they are being provoked to make sense. Whatever interest they have in becoming different, in posing questions and reaching beyond where they are, can only be a function of their situational circumstances; and the teacher who pays no heed o them is hardly in a position to show respect for a student's integrity or for

his/her "capacity for independent judgment." Independent judgment, after all, is an achievement possible only for human beings who share the world with others, who can communicate with others, who have been nurtured and sustained in some kind of community. In today's schools, it cannot be assumed that all students inhabit precisely the same world, nor that they are equally capable of independent judgment. This is why it is so important for the teacher to create situations in which students can speak about their everyday realities, speak with each other and to each other in the light of who they are and what they are striving to become. It is why it is so necessary to involve students with their own learning, to permit reflection upon what they learn from their own perspective and their own ground. As the perspectives widen, as more modes of symbolizing become available to them, as they extend their sense of personal agency in the process of discovery, the capacity for independent judgment may be enhanced--along with their critico-creative capacities, their capacities for imaginativeness and fidelity and curiosity and even hope. If the concept of mastery is to be joined to the idea of teaching, this may be part of what mastery makes possible.

Dewey wrote, with respect to "masters" in the fields of art: "The masters themselves usually serve an apprenticeship; but as they mature they absorb what they have learned into their own individual experience, vision, and style. They are masters precisely because they do not follow either models or rules but subdue both of these things to serve enlargement of personal experience" (1934, p. 301). Not only does this apply to mastery in teaching; it suggests that mastery can never be defined with reference to a set of models or examples or articulated rules. As I view it, persons who become master teachers are likely to become so because of a mysterious,

probably tacit awareness of how to "subdue" models and rules in the manner described. But there must be an atmosphere in which "enlargement of personal experience," like individuality itself, is affirmed and given regard. It must be an atmosphere characterized by the "full, sharing, feeling relationship" among teachers and students, leaders and followers, James MacGregor Burns associates with "transforming leadership" (1979, p. 448). "Ultimately," he wrote, "education and leadership shade into each other to become almost inseparable, but only when both are defined as the reciprocal raising of levels of motivation rather than indoctrination or coercion."

If mastery is to be valued, there must of course be agreed-upon principles that might make reciprocity possible. Louis Arnaud Reid has said that the application of principles to practice "takes place always through the transforming medium of personality and personal action" (1962, p. 183). If, indeed, the "sharing, feeling relationship" one would hope to see among teachers and their students grows out of a soil of moral commitment, personal action to realize articulated values becomes essential if there is to be anything approximating mastery. As I view those values, they include regard for the individuality and the sense of agency of the other (whoever he/she may be) freedom and transcendence rather than sheltering and control, care, solicitude, intellectual passion, integrity, clarity, mutuality, concern.

In such a context, merit can only be discerned in attachment to and action on such values. John Rawls, who has developed a conception of goodness as rationality, puts great emphasis upon a person's sense of his/her own worth. Among the circumstances that support that sense, he said, are having a "rational plan of life" and "finding our person and deeds

appreciated and confirmed by others who are likewise esteemed and their association enjoyed" (1971, p. 440). The "excellences," as he saw them, include such goods as imagination and wit, beauty and grace, and other abilities good for others as well as ourselves when "properly displayed." And then: "From our standpoint, the excellences are goods since they enable us to carry out a more satisfying plan of life enhancing our sense of mastery" (p. 443).

For Dewey, "Discipline, Culture, social efficiency, personal refinement, improvement of character are but phases of the growth of capacity" to participate in the experience of social life and in "a more intense, disciplined, and expanding realization of meanings" (1916, p. 417). And, for him, "conscious life is a continual beginning afresh." Self-esteem, participation, excellences, consciousness, and new beginnings: merit may partake of all these things. Surely, the teacher who is able to release students for "the widening and deepening of conscious life" Dewey described cannot but be thought in some measure "meritorious," in the contexts of reciprocity I have tried to define. At once, mastery in teaching, if made possible by the commitments earlier identified, cannot but be permeated by a quality of merit, even as the sense of merit--or at least of self-worth--may be a consequence of freeing people to learn.

In conclusion, I cannot separate the concepts of mastery and merit; nor can I separate the concept of the master teacher from a vision of a transformed school. The idea of mastery, I think, like the idea of standard, should function as a type of ideal possibility, drawing us to what is not yet, provoking us to reach beyond ourselves. If the repressed metaphors it carries with it summon up images of external control, of cold authority and power, this ought to intensify the challenge to rethink what

mastery might mean. We know enough to understand that authentic learning occurs when persons are empowered to move beyond what they are taught, to act together to bring into being something new. What greater merit can be gained than in the act of freeing persons to begin?

References

Arendt, H. (1958). The human condition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Burns, J. M. (1979). Leadership. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1934). Art as experience. New York: Minton, Balch & Co.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind. New York: Basic Books.

Green, T. F. (1971) The activities of teaching. New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Howard, V. (1982). Artistry. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Passmore, J. (1980). The philosophy of teaching. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Peters, R. S. (1978) Ethnics and education. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Polanyi, M (1962). Personal knowledge. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Rawls, J. (1971). A theory of justice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Reid, L. A. (1962). Philosophy and education. London: Heinemann.

Ryle, G. (1967). Teaching and training. In R. S. Peters (Ed.), The Concept of Education. New York: The Humanities Press.

Scheffler, I. (1973). Philosophical Models of Teaching. In Reason in Teaching. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Whitehead, A. N. (1949). The aims of education. New York: Mentor Books.

THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE AND THE MASTER TEACHER CONCEPT

Gary A. Griffin

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Introduction

That there is widespread concern about the quality of the nation's schools and their educational programs is currently a given in American society. This concern is manifest in formal and informal ways but probably is most sharply exemplified in the various reports that have appeared during the past year (Gardner, 1983). These documents range from research findings about the nation's schools (Goodlad, 1983) through largely political or ideological propositions about what schools should be accomplishing (Adler, 1982) to statements of professional purpose (Boyer, 1983). It is safe to claim that the role and status of public elementary and secondary schools in the United States are receiving more attention now than they have been given the past three decades.

A natural, although partially misguided, target for the criticism of the nation's schools is the large number of teachers who provide instruction in them. It is natural for teachers to be on the receiving end of the criticism because conventional wisdom supports the belief that the teacher is the key element in determinations about quality of instruction. The teacher is in the most public place in many ways. He or she is the subject of dinner table conversation, sometimes the source or cause of family squabbles about television habits or children's use of leisure time, and, it is safe to say, the object of much admiration specifically and little admiration abstractly. It is partially misguided because the teacher is only one member of a complex network of organizations that have as their reason for being influence upon

instruction. This network includes state legislatures, federal agencies, private sector companies, state and local education departments, and colleges and universities that prepare teachers and other school workers.

It is important to note that this round of national concern for the quality of teaching is accompanied by the recognition that teachers are not well-enough compensated for their important work (Ward, 1983). This recognition is demonstrated in state and local efforts to increase teachers' salaries, in political debates regarding the federal role in the educational enterprise, and in the concerted efforts by teacher organizations to raise the public status of teachers in the larger society (National Education Association, 1983). These and other initiatives reflect the realization that quality instruction, however that term is defined, is and will continue to be largely dependent upon the knowledge and skill of individual teachers and that to ensure high levels of knowledge and skill it will be necessary to accompany demands for quality with the lure of adequate compensation.

One proposal to accomplish the dual demand of teaching quality and adequate compensation is the so-called master teacher concept. This proposal has a somewhat checkered history in the United States in that it has been tried in a variety of settings, has been hailed as successful or a failure depending upon the criteria used to make such judgments, and is lacking in any clear or widely-agreed-to definition (Cordes, 1983). There is a confusion between merit pay proposals and master teacher proposals. Conceptions of merit differ according to expectations held for teachers and schools. Perceptions of mastery range from the purely ideological to the more currently fashionable "scientific" one as defined in large measure by the presence of a research base. Fundamentally, however, the master teacher plans all seem to be concerned with (1) identifying and rewarding the most productive teachers,

(2) providing those teachers with a larger share of the salary resource pool than other teachers, and (3) providing a stimulus for both retaining the best teachers and attracting prospective teachers who would meet the standards of mastery.

This paper considers the master teacher concept (not merit pay) from what appear to be two dominant patterns as observed in practice and as discussed at policy levels of governance (i.e., state and local boards of education and departments of education or central offices). Knowledge about the school as a workplace is used to develop a perspective on the potential for these proposals to come to fruition. Finally, a set of recommendations for dealing with the proposals is advanced.

Who Is the Master Teacher?

As noted above, there appear to be two dominant conceptions of the master teacher. The differences between the two are important in terms of their "fit" with what we know about how schools work, how teachers are prepared, and what expectations prospective and inservice teachers bring to schools and classrooms.

The first conception seems to be rooted in a "better than" assumption. That is, one teacher engages in essentially the same activities as another but is judged to be better at accomplishing those activities than the other (Cordes, 1983). This approach to mastery raises the questions and dilemmas associated with specification of criteria to determine who is better than someone else. It also brings into focus the related problems of objectivity, validity, and reliability of human judgments as they are applied to complex social situations.

The second conception can be considered from a "more than" perspective. In this approach the master teacher is one who may or may not engage in

conventional teaching activity but who also performs specialized functions in schools and classrooms (National Education Association, 1983). In such a case, the master teacher may be a person who is charged with curriculum planning for a group of other teachers, who monitors student progress in diagnostic/prescriptive ways, who formulates and administers evaluation schemes, or who serves as mentor to new or experienced teachers who are deemed in need of special assistance in order to become more effective.

For either case, the better than or the more than, the introduction of a master teacher plan into ongoing elementary and secondary schools will have to take into account the ways in which those schools historically and currently do their work. Three overarching themes related to teaching and schooling may be helpful in terms of thinking through the potential of a master teacher plan for becoming a meaningful and influential school practice. They are (1) institutional regularities of elementary and secondary schools, (2) teaching as work, and (3) the teacher as semi-professional.

Institutional Regularities of Elementary and Secondary Schools

It is an unfortunate truism that public policy often is formulated and enforced in spite of, rather than because of, conditions that are present in the area of human activity meant to be influenced. In some cases this is manifest as flying in the face of large chunks of public opinion (e.g., civil rights policy). In others, as is the case of many master teacher plans, it is manifest by a lack of a coherent body of information that would suggest caution or redirection of effort. Master teacher plans, most often formulated at policy levels of organizations or legislative arenas, do, indeed, challenge much of what we know about the ways that schools work. Several of these are briefly discussed here as institutional regularities of elementary and secondary schools.

1. Teachers typically work in isolation from one another (Sarason, 1971). They meet with groups of students for all or most of a school day in elementary schools and with groups of students who move on to other teachers in secondary schools. The students observe one another and their teachers but the teachers usually observe only the students, not one another. Also, teachers seldom engage in problem solving groups and often talk with one another only during those instances that are respites from teaching, in the lunchroom or the teachers lounge, when talk about the activities of teaching is not surprisingly anecdotal, short in duration, and only a piece of a set of larger social interactions. This isolation of teachers from one another can be seen as problematic in terms of implementing master teacher plans. On the one hand, if mastery is to be defined as "better than", the isolation requires that someone other than teachers engage in assessment and decision making partly as a matter of convenience (teachers have more important duties in their respective classrooms) and partly as a matter of knowledge (the isolation prevents teachers from being knowledgeable enough about teaching practices to make judgments about their peers' work). On the other hand, and more problematic, the approach of "more than" requires that teachers differ in some distinguishable ways, again suggesting that judgments should be based on knowledge beyond that which is brought to bear upon working with instructional groups, and again leading to the speculation that the judgments will be made by persons outside the teaching force.

It can readily be seen that the isolation of teachers from one another fits the historical pattern of administrator decisions about teachers but does not fit more recent recommendations from within the teaching ranks that teachers be central to the decision making process. The tension between these

two points of view is logical. The resolution of that tension is not so logically apparent.

2. As suggested above, the school systems of this country have been hierarchically organized with a top-down, policy to practice orientation (Griffin, 1983). Contrary rhetoric notwithstanding, this orientation persists and current experience suggests that the top-down direction of influence upon schooling practice is gaining, rather than losing, strength. States are mandating behavioral specifications for teacher certification, competency tests for students and teachers, beginning teacher assistance/assessment programs and local districts are developing system-wide curricula that are highly specific in form and substance and not open for question or negotiation (Griffin, Barnes, O'Neal, Edwards, Defino, & Hukill, 1983). These and other practices are reinforcing the hierarchical structure of providing public education despite the flurry of activity and talk about making schools more collegial, more professional that characterized the late 1960's and the 1970's.

Master teacher plans, as they are currently being discussed and implemented, are compatible with the widespread practices of policy formulation and implementation but are not compatible with the set of beliefs that characterize the talk about teaching and schooling. The tension between the beliefs (e.g., teachers should be central participants in decisions about curriculum, school organization, and instruction) and the practices (e.g., all new teachers will demonstrate proficiency in a number of competency areas) is an important element for consideration in thinking about master teacher plans. Because master teacher plans are explicit oppositions to the notion of teacher sameness, that "a teacher is a teacher is a teacher," they can easily be formulated to fall into the historically accurate camp by having judgments

about mastery made by vested authority figures in the system (i.e., administrators) or break relatively new ground by including teachers in the decision making process. The latter, it should be recognized, would be severely restricted by the teacher isolation regularity if it were allowed to persist as part of school culture.

3. Schools and teachers are under enormous pressure to be accountable. Professional, political, and lay figures are calling into question just who or what is responsible for what they perceive as inadequate or inferior consequences of schooling (Hacker, 1984). As noted above, one consequence of this general accountability movement is an attempt to identify and reward exemplary teachers. Another consequence, less apparent, is the inherent conflict between the ways that the accountability movement has influenced schooling practice and the possibilities of dealing with the complicated issue of mastery.

The accountability movement, whether for new teachers or third graders or exiting high school students, has emphasized demonstration of minimum acceptable competence for, respectively, state certification/licensure, advancement to the third grade, and the granting of a diploma (Edwards, 1984). This attention to the threshold of acceptability appears to have had several effects, among them the quite logical perseverance of researchers, evaluators, and practitioners to define, measure, and defend what should be the lowest common denominator in terms of acceptable student or teacher performance. This perseverance, however, has implicitly denied searching for and validating that which can be called mastery. If asking a certain number of higher order questions is necessary to demonstrate minimum competence, is asking more of those questions mastery? If students are "on-task" for a minimally acceptable portion of a school hour, is an increase in that portion a demonstration of a

master teacher at work (Soar & Soar, 1983)? Clearly, these are trivial examples but, it must be feared, they are not necessarily exotic or otherwise unusual.

The issue here is over whether the preoccupation with minimum competency for our schools' student and teacher populations will have deleterious effects upon the identification and reward of mastery. Further, is the technology that supports the search for minimum competency by definition a countervailing force in the search for mastery? In terms of the two modes of mastery noted earlier, more than and better than, current available technology is not appropriate to determine better than. It may be possible to develop such methods and procedures, but it seems more reasonable to assume that different role requirements (more than) could be more readily defined, observed, and judged. In this instance, our preoccupation with minimum competence may be helpful if we frame our question as, "In order to be an effective helping teacher, what knowledge and skill must be possessed and demonstrated?" This question sets a threshold but does it according to a specification of role rather than setting vertical "cutoff points" for reward of service.

4. Schools have been quite accurately accused of goal ambiguity and goal overlap (Miles & Schmuck, 1971). That is, some publicly expressed goals of schooling are so ambiguous that they are difficult to grasp ideologically, practically, or evaluatively (e.g., all students will become good citizens). Other school goals overlap one another and the overlap is often conflictful (e.g., all students will show respect for United States government institutions and all students will demonstrate consequences of socially responsible critical thinking). In like manner, expectations for teacher behavior can be considered as goals and, in equally like manner, they can be ambiguous and overlapping. Observations of practice suggest a continuum of

effects upon teachers of explicit and implicit expectations for their behavior. This continuum ranges from, "Just tell me what to do and I'll do it" through "I know what is expected and will go along with some but not with the rest" to "Don't you dare tell me what to do, I'm a professional." Very formal research procedures as well as informal interactions with school-based colleagues support the conclusion that this continuum is acted out not just at national, system, or district levels of activity but within individual schools (Teacher Center IR&DS Team, 1982). Clearly, then, there are teachers who are very unclear about expectations, others who are clearer but somewhat resistant, and others who are rightly or wrongly obstinately opposed to gearing up to meet externally imposed expectations.

If goal ambiguity and overlap is an accurate picture of schooling in terms of teacher and student behavior, what fate awaits a plan that has some certainty built into it? If a master teacher proposal defies the goal ambiguity and specifies in some detail what is meant by mastery, it is possible to speculate that it will be ill-served by the existing school organization or that it will be yet another reflection of the ambiguity and, therefore, subject to differential and perhaps controversial implementation.

5. Schooling phenomena are more often situation-specific than not (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974). Although they can be discussed abstractly in such general terms as student discipline, underachievement, teaching effectiveness, or low morale, the manifestations of those abstractions take on different forms and characters the closer one gets to the action. The reasons and rationales for giving public praise to a student, for example, are very likely quite different depending upon whether that praise is meted out in a school located in a harsh, inner city environment or in an honors class in Beverly Hills. The curriculum demands made upon teachers and students are

different in primary classrooms from the ones made in high school classrooms. The need to establish a safe and orderly environment for learning is a less sharp demand in some settings than in others. And, the knowledge and skill needed to make appropriate and meaningful instructional decisions are different from situation to situation. The context influence on teaching and learning is enormously powerful.

If one's end in view is the institutionalization of a master teacher plan, it is of both political and organizational importance to recognize and act upon knowledge about situation specific schooling and teaching. Too often, it appears, policy makers fall into the trap of assuming that schools and classrooms are all alike, that pedagogical activity and curriculum intentions can be transferred with equal effect from situation to situation, that not only is "a teacher is a teacher is a teacher" but that "a student is a student is a student." This mindset denies human variability in its most deeply respected sense, and is in direct conflict with basic and applied research regarding missions and consequences of schooling. For a master teacher plan to be reflective of the integrity of individuals as people and professionals as well as of the dramatic range of teaching-learning situations, it must account for how mastery is defined meaningfully and demonstrated effectively in a variety of different but equally valued contexts.

6. Schools have limited resources and the limitations are not easily altered as a consequence of doing either an exemplary or a poor job of educating students. Although there have been instances in which public predisposition has influenced resource availability, California's Proposition 13 comes to mind, that predisposition more often is abstract rather than specific. Further, the resources available to school officers is largely

earmarked by law or by some other regulation. For example, tenure laws and negotiated agreements regarding salary increases make unavailable for other purposes funds that are needed to reimburse teachers. Likewise, state and local policies regarding desegregation implicitly demand certain expenditures of funds so that compliance can be reached through, for instance, expensive bussing programs. In short, the limitations that are set around school funds and which are largely not negotiable as a consequence of school performance are powerful delimiting devices when it comes to promoting new, cost-incurring practices in schools.

Master teacher plans, almost by definition, call for additional funds. The unperceptive observer of schools would believe that these funds are solely for the purpose of rewarding exemplary teachers. More sophisticated observers, on the other hand, recognize that support will also be needed to plan and implement a master teacher program (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). The planning and implementation activities will require reallocation of human and material resources, and this reallocation is difficult to accomplish given the number of competing claims for those resources. A demonstration of the difficulty of accomplishing this feat is in the state-mandated programs designed to assist and assess first year teachers. In such programs it has been necessary to either find or reassign funds and human skill and energy to bring them to any sort of fruition. And, importantly, it appears that as intentions, regulations, and procedures move from the state level of activity to local implementation, the presence or absence of resources at the local level is a critical issue in successful enactment of beginning teacher programs (Edwards, 1984).

There is no reason to suspect that the institutionalization of master teacher programs will be different from any other thorny resource reallocation

problems. In fact, the difficulty may well be even greater because an entire new layer of activity, rather than the replacement of one activity with another, is involved. That is, a new mathematics text is more often than not a replacement issue and already-designated resources are shifted from one publishing house to another. But, master teacher schemes, as in the case of some of the new teacher programs, are predicated on the availability of resources that are additional to those conventionally available. Tough decisions result from making a commitment to such additions, decisions that, in some cases, may force confrontations with basic tenets about doing the business of schooling. Are some teachers denied the typical and expected step increase for putting in another year of teaching? Are some teachers released from service prior to tenure decisions because of the need to reward those designated as masters? Do teachers engage in competitive exercises in order to gain access to master status? Are class sizes increased in order to decrease the numbers of teachers, thereby making available more funds for reward?

This view of the master teacher from the workplace has so far included a set of institutional regularities that characterize historical and current practices in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. Others could have been included. The ones presented here are believed to be powerful influences on the introduction of master teacher plans in ongoing school settings.

Teaching As Work

It is only in the past two decades that widespread information about what actually goes on in large number of classrooms has been available to practitioners or the persistently inquisitive citizen (Good, 1981). Much of what we and others know and have known about classroom activity, including teacher behavior, has been directly reported by school-age family members,

experienced by those of us who are or have been teachers, or inferred from reports of student outcomes in the forms of published mean achievement scores. Although it was argued that the teacher is perhaps the most public of school-affiliated persons, what that teacher does hour by hour is not easily accessible information. As a consequence of large-scale studies of teaching, mostly funded by the National Institute of Education, more detailed information has become available about the actual work of teaching (Berliner & Koehler, 1983).

To understand the work of teaching is, in some measure, to understand the possibilities and problems inherent in rewarding that work in qualitatively differential ways. This section presents briefly a set of dimensions of the work of teaching with the intention of extending the discussion of teaching mastery. A broader examination of what constitutes teaching as work is called for, particularly in light of the recent narrowly focused attention given to minimum standards for certification and retention of teachers in many states and districts.

1. Teaching is, in greater measure than many suspect, the management of an uncertain environment (Griffin & Schlechty, 1983). The uncertainty is a product of a large number of conditions, among them the universal and compulsory attendance requirements, the increasingly wide range of student characteristics, the vulnerability of the school as a social institution, the erosion of the relations between the school and the family, the tensions between the norms of the school and those of the student peer group, the relative absence of enforceable standards of student behavior, and so on. These and other conditions place real boundaries on the degree of predictability that can be assured in schools and classrooms.

Probably the most frequent criticism of master teacher plans, from teachers' points of view, is that it is unrealistic to expect the same or similar outcomes across schools and classrooms because of the variability of student groups. This is an implicit expression of knowledge about the uncertainty of the teaching-learning environments of schooling and an explicit expression of the situation specific nature of doing teaching. It is particularly apt in discussions of master teacher plans that rest largely or wholely on pupil outcomes, measured by standardized achievement test scores, as the determiner of mastery.

2. The work of teaching is seen by most lay persons and by a surprisingly large number of teachers as primarily or solely interacting with students. Although this part of the teacher's work is certainly at the heart of the teaching enterprise, it is only a partial picture as will be claimed at a later point in this paper.

The teacher-student interactions in which teachers engage are multiple, complex in nature, and persistent. They are demonstrations of the knowledge held by teachers of general and specific student characteristics, curriculum requirements, pacing, expectations for individual students and classroom groups, breadth of curriculum knowledge, depth of social and cultural understanding, and materials of instruction. These interactions provide a focus for doing the work of teaching and are, quite rightly, also the focus for making judgments about the quality of that work.

An unfortunate consequence of the more fortunate body of research that has centered on teacher behavior is the narrowing of vision about what teaching is. A trend has developed that seems to suggest that what research has found to be effective <u>is</u> teaching. More unfortunately, the effective teaching research findings have begun to be applied in ways that most

researchers would find offensive at best and unethical at worst (Barnes, 1981). Policy makers and some educational practitioners have adopted the findings and mandated their demonstration in contexts and with students markedly dissimilar to the ones that were subjects in the original research studies. Although there is some commonsense ring to expecting that all teachers, regardless of subject matter or age of students, provide some "wait time" when an answer to a question is not immediately forthcoming, for example, it is not appropriate to rationalize that expectation because "research says that it is effective." Researchers are very cautious regarding the applicability of their findings, especially in correlational studies. Practitioners, however, seem to find some comfort in believing that educational research provides some certainty to bolster up their activities.

If master teacher plans focus on teacher-student interactions solely for determining merit, they are insufficient. If they depend upon an across-the-board use of research findings without attending to the ways in which that research was conducted, they are fraudulent.

3. A good part of a teacher's work involves planning. Despite the growing tendency to mandate highly specific curricula and the historical truth of the power of commercially-prepared texts to determine instruction, there is still a large gap to be filled between a set of instructional intentions and a captive student population (Goodlad & Klein, 1974). Teachers must adapt curriculum materials to meet characteristics of student. They must clarify and make specific instructional goals and purposes. They must sequence instruction such that it doesn't overwhelm some students and stultify others. They must search out and make accessible appropriate stimuli for instruction. In short, they must plan. And planning is time-consuming, intellectually demanding work that requires knowledge, skill, and sensitivity.

Master teacher plans that fall into the "better than" orientation must attend to what kinds of planning is better than other kinds of planning and, importantly, must identify the indicators of both. Plans that focus on the "more than" orientation must determine what constitutes planning for the teacher who is charged with that task and develop means to ensure that the planning requirements are met. In either case, to ignore the critical work of planning when determining teacher mastery is to ignore a central teaching function.

4. Teachers, by definition, are people who know about students in general and in particular, and know how to act upon that knowledge. Teaching as work is in large part characterized by making knowledge-based decisions about the best ways to put students in contact with aspects of the culture such that learning occurs. These decisions are informed by the degree to which teachers understand student characteristics, learning styles, preferences, past histories, and physical, emotional, and cognitive stages of young peoples' development.

The work of teaching is partly knowing and largely doing, and the knowing and doing are often inseparable. Master teacher plans must account for what the qualitatively better teacher knows about students and what s/he does about that knowledge in ongoing classrooms. Blindly following a prescribed curriculum may be a demonstration of teacher acquiescence to externally imposed demands. Modifying a prescribed curriculum may be a demonstration of how the teacher's knowledge of students leads to important facilitative instructional decisions. The "better than" master teacher plan must account for what the teacher knows about students and how that knowledge informs classroom decisions. The "more than" master teacher plan must sort out role

expectations on this issue so that those teachers of whom sensitivity to learner characteristics is demanded can be assessed appropriately.

5. Although the relationships between the home and the school appear to have deteriorated in recent years, there is some evidence to support the requirement that teachers work with parents toward the end of providing effective educational experiences for students. The nature of this home-school interaction varies in practice from seldom and regulated (e.g., pupil reporting periods) through sporadic (e.g., informing parents of student rule infractions) to frequent and systematic (e.g., regular written or in-person communications between parents and teachers).

If the work of teaching includes attention to home-school interaction, a master teacher plan should account for the number, nature, and quality of these interactions. Partly because of the tendency of school organizations to close in upon themselves, the home-school aspects of doing the work of teaching have, in many places, fallen in disarray. A master teacher plan, if it is comprehensive, could re-establish this function as part of a reward system.

6. A traditionally-held value about teachers is that they work toward their own growth and improvement (Courter & Ward, 1983). Typical reward systems for teachers take into account such phenomena as numbers of "inservice days" teachers register for, ways in which they spend sabbatical leaves, and the number of university graduate credits that are earned. Part of doing the work of teaching, then, can be considered as engaging in professional development activities.

Professional development, though, seems in many cases to be a pro forma specification that is followed more out of resignation than out of interest or desire. Informal observation as well as formal inquiry, however, support the

less-than-rigorous conclusion that teachers who are inquisitive, self reflective, concerned about their effectiveness, and eager to be somehow "better" are teachers who are, indeed, judged as "better." A master teacher plan can take this into account in a variety of ways other than simply counting credits. Certainly, a "more than" orientation would lead to the examination of the nature of professional development opportunities sought out and experienced so that the match with role requirements is clear.

Other aspects of the work of teaching could be examined in terms of gaining a more complete understanding of the feasibility of master teacher plans. Such aspects might include pupil and program evaluation, subject matter expertise, the exercise of teacher authority in the school and the system (as opposed to only the classroom), the contributions of teachers to the quality of school life, the long-term and cumulative effects of teaching as opposed to the short-term observations of teaching effects, and so forth. The point to be made here is that teaching as work is complex, multi-faceted, highly interactive, intellectually and practically demanding, and largely uncertain. When one "sees" teaching in this way, not as just an easily observed set of teacher-student interactions, plans for differentiating among teachers that simplify rather than clarify what teaching is become meaningless and trivial.

The Teacher As Semi-Professional

The creeping use of the word "professional" to describe occupations ranging from brain surgeon to sanitation engineer has eroded the precision of the term. Certainly, in everyday parlance the teacher can be considered a professional, but in more precise language usage the teacher is, at best, a semi-professional (Etzioni, 1969). This semi-professional status of the teacher in the society and the school organization has sharp implications for

master teacher plans. Several of the more obvious status characteristics are discussed here.

1. Teachers tend to depend upon craft knowledge rather than a carefully constructed, systematically codified, and widely-agreed-to knowledge base (Lieberman & Miller, 1979). Their actions appear to be based more on what they have learned to do over time than on what has been shown by theory or research should be done. Their beliefs tend to override what knowledge is available. The demands of a given situation at a given time are more likely the sole or primary determiners of decisions than is a body of knowledge available to "teachers only." There is, in short, a "technical core" deficiency (Williams, 1982).

Professionals, by strict definition, work from a knowledge base that is largely unavailable to persons outside the profession. There is some evidence to suggest that teachers "teach as they were taught" (Goodlad, 1983). If this is so, everyone who has gone to school for a period of time could qualify as an expert on teaching. This conclusion is, of course, somewhat overdrawn but it is not outside the realm of possibility that it could drive policy decisions about teacher preparation, as witnessed in at least one Northeastern state.

It has been claimed that there is a growing knowledge base available to teachers to empower them to be more than semi-professionals. This claim may be open to some question, but even if it is not there is substantial evidence that the knowledge base is not systematically a part of large numbers of teacher education programs, preservice or inservice (Griffin, 1983). As noted earlier, the research on teaching findings, if used appropriately and, in some cases, cautiously, can be considered a piece of a reasonable knowledge base for doing the work of teaching. But it is rare to find this body of

information central or even peripheral to a teacher education effort. (This condition appears to be changing somewhat but the nature of the change can often be characterized as an inappropriate use of the knowledge.)

Given the observation that teachers work more from craft-derived knowledge than from a more scientifically validated one, master teacher plans have as prerequisites the determination and public announcement of what knowledge is of most worth in doing teaching. The drift toward unsubstantiated claims about the utility of fifteen years' of effective teaching research should not be allowed dominance in formulating decisional criteria. By placing the research in an appropriate role in determining what is mastery and what is not, the formulators of master teacher plans then face the difficult issue of deciding what craft knowledge is of most worth and what propositions about teaching should be used to guide practice.

2. Teachers once seemed to have considerable autonomy in their roles. That is, they made long-term and daily decisions about curriculum content, instructional strategy, and evaluation procedures. They were under little centralized authority or jurisdiction. They could, by virtue of close relationships with parents of their students, specify in some detail what certain students must do or not do. The relatively high status of the teacher role in the community also gave them considerable influence in decisions about how schooling and teaching were viewed.

Those times are over in most, if not all, of the public school communities in the United States. Teachers now work within clearly and sharply drawn boundaries. Autonomy has diminished. Teachers are influenced by local, state, and Federal rules and regulations. The accountability structures have brought a certain uneasy respectability to "teaching to the test." So-called "professional decision making" is less visible than is a

discernible uniformity across classroom and, indeed, even school district jurisdictions. Once again, the attention to minimum competency may have resulted in a lowest common denominator set of practices.

It can be argued that the relative absence of teacher autonomy fits hierarchically imposed master teacher plans in that following the directive of an authority figure may be exactly the appropriate context condition to make such a plan work. One could also argue, however, that greater, rather than less, autonomy on the part of teachers would give clearer indications of whether the teacher was or was not demonstrating mastery. That is, given more degrees of freedom, it would be possible for a teacher to shine in relation to his or her peers whereas limitations on autonomy produce such a sameness that making distinctions becomes an empty exercise.

3. One hallmark of a professional is the targeted educational experiences he or she has prior to and after joining a workforce. These specialized learning opportunities are aimed directly at promoting high levels of skill in doing the work of the profession and, consequently, differentiating the professional from other citizens. It would not occur to most Americans to make claims for surgical or litigatory knowledge and skill, but it does occur to them to make claims about teaching. The other side of that coin, of course, is that teachers and others in elementary and secondary school settings are hard-pressed to articulate what it is they do that requires specialized knowledge and skill development (Griffin, Barnes, Hughes, O'Neal, Edwards, & Defino, 1983).

This is not to argue that such specialization is not part of being a teacher but that it is not well articulated and is not firmly supported by evidence. There are specifications for conducting "inquiry lessons," for formulating higher order questions, for promoting "discovery learning." But

these and other proposals for teaching have not made deep inroads into classrooms and schools. Combining this conclusion with the apparent growing uniformity of teaching and schooling raises the spectre of a teacher as one who has some substantial liberal arts educational background (rather than professional education) and who then conforms to the demands of the system into which he or she is to somehow "fit." Such a conception of teacher is already part of the conventional wisdom of the public and some educational policy makers. This view is partly supported by the widespread reputation of education courses as Mickey Mouse labs, by the growing public disenchantment with the education of children and youth, by the testimony of public school persons who talk about providing student teachers with experiences to know about "the real world of teaching," and by the beliefs that the least and the dullest enter, and are welcomed by, schools and colleges of education.

Most sensitive and knowledgeable educators would admit that professional education courses, preservice and inservice, are lacking in focus, often ill-articulated, and inconsistently connected to a knowledge base. But, these same educators would probably argue that such need not be the case. There is a slowly growing knowledge base, there is a set of proposals for teaching that require specialized knowledge and skill, there are ways of understanding and acting in classroom settings that are different from other orientations, and there are points of view about teaching and learning that appear to have different consequences for providing instruction (Lanier, 1983).

In terms of master teacher proposals, the semi-professional issue of specialized training raises the questions of what to expect, what to ask for, what to reward. And, in the event that such questions can be asked and answered of teacher preparation, for instance, how can mastery be sorted out from nonmastery? Although there are instances when one assumes that a mastery

learning model is at work (keep hammering at it until you get it right), a master teacher proposition assumes and accepts that some will be better than others. Before such an assumption can be dealt with, it will be necessary to define teaching and defend in educators' and the public's eyes that it is acceptable to have less than masterful teachers with some students while other students interact with masters. Such a defense, once it is clearly and publicly demanded, will be difficult to mount and even more difficult to support.

4. Teachers, as has been implied, are very vulnerable members of the educational system and this condition supports the conclusion that teachers are semi-professionals. The vulnerability can be demonstrated on many fronts, only two of which will be discussed here.

It has already been acknowledged that teachers are the most publicly accessible of educators. This accessibility is reflected, to some degree, in the fact that the financial rewards of teaching are controlled in large measure by the willingness of citizens, through referendums and actions of elected officials, to support schools and teachers well or poorly. In many states in this nation there are proposals for "improving" schools, for promoting "excellence," for making educational opportunities for students more meaningful and more powerful. These proposals, based in large measure in the mindset of cleaning up the educational system rather than making more widespread currently valued practices, receive a good press until price tags are affixed to the suggested reforms. It is at this point that governors and state legislators and local school boards begin pulling in the reins.

What happens, of course, is that the teachers are blamed for the poor instruction, programs are planned to deal with this deficit, and then the public mandate for economy, always present in the electorate and perhaps even

more dramatically so now, given the aging of the populace, takes over. The result of this cycle is most often that business as usual resumes, the politicos take credit for attempting to deal with the problem, and the anonymous "they," meaning the public at large, are blamed for penny pinching.

The teachers, then, are vulnerable semi-professionals who have little say in how they are to be reimbursed for their considerable expenditures of time and energy in preparing for and doing teaching. They have no major voice in determining their salaries, differentiating among themselves in terms of reimbursements, or, in fact, calling peers into question because of less-than-desirable pedagogical practice.

Teachers are also vulnerable members of school systems. They are the recipients of policy decisions, as has been noted, and are expected to do the bidding of persons who have more vested authority in the system. It is virtually impossible to visit a school in 1984 without observing and hearing testimony of how teachers are expected to follow administrative directives that are clearly in ideological and practical opposition to the conventions of teaching and learning. And, as can be seen in these same schools, the passing down through the school hierarchy of paper shuffling and report writing, what used to be called administrivia, is rampant.

Why does this occur? Why do teachers continue to be on the receiving end of dicta on high? A good part of the reason is the semi-professional status of the teacher group. And this status has been reinforced in many ways by the teacher organizations which, until recently, have maintained that differential rewards for differential work or quality of the same work is somehow divisive. Divisiveness cannot be tolerated as long as teachers are seen as "workers" in a system that may <u>depend</u> upon their vulnerability in making fiscal decisions.

Teachers, then, are vulnerable to public pressure and special interest and to in-system demands and decision making. There are real and often severe institutional boundaries placed around their activity, and those boundaries both respond to and continue to define their semi professional status.

Master teacher plans, in many important ways, can be seen as means to increase the professional status of teachers. But this consequence will only be real if they move away from narrow definitions of task and toward greater exercise of curricular and pedagogical freedom of decision making and activity. The master teacher plan that is prompted more by expectations formulated by authorities in states and local districts has less power to achieve the goal of promoting professionalism than one that involves teachers in grappling with what it is to be "excellent." And, the proposals that consider differentiating teachers on the basis of differing role expectations have more promise than ones that rest on the assumption that some teaching tasks can be done better by small numbers of teachers than by others in the teaching force.

Four issues related to the semiprofessional status of teachers have been presented in terms of their relation to master teacher proposals: the relative absence of a broad and deep knowledge base, lack of teacher autonomy, poorly articulated professional education, and vulnerability. Others could have been included. The intent for this paper was to include indicators that would help clarify certain of the fundamental problems that must be faced as master teacher proposals are introduced into school places.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As one way to focus on master teacher concepts, this paper has presented three sets of interacting variables that help to understand the school as a workplace. The first set described conditions that were called institutional

regularities of elementary and secondary schools and included knowledge about teacher isolation, the hierarchical organization of schools, accountability, goal ambiguity and overlap, situation specificity, and resource limitations. The second set presented a set of propositions regarding teaching as work and included ideas related to management of uncertain environments, the central role of teacher-student interactions, teacher planning, knowledge about students, home-school interactions, and teacher growth and development. The third section derives essentially from the first two and notes that teachers are semi-professionals because of dependence upon craft knowledge, limited autonomy in doing their work, professional education that is limited and often not coherent, and societal and organizational vulnerability. These descriptions of schools, teachers, and teaching were selected because of their potential impact upon proposals to implement master teacher plans.

Master teacher plans were characterized as being of two basic kinds. The first is one that suggests that master teachers are those persons who do the work of teaching "better than" other teachers who do the same work. The second is one that suggests that master teachers do "more than" what other teachers do; they work at different tasks, tasks that require specialized knowledge and skill.

Throughout the paper it has been implied that the more feasible of the two proposals is the "more than" one. Given the nature of the school as a workplace, the traditional and typical norms, traditions, and beliefs, and the complexity of the work of teaching, the "more than" or differentiated role definition seems to be the model that has the most promise of (1) guaranteeing the integrity of all (or most) teachers, (2) fitting the historical schema of the school in society, (3) making the work of teaching more manageable, (4) allowing opportunity for differential reimbursement for service, (5) promoting

professionalism among teachers, (6) complementing the call for accountability, and (7) reducing the probability of a public outcry when one's child's teacher is not recognized as at mastery.

Whatever model is adopted by school officers, four recommendations for implementation are advanced:

1. Broaden the dialogue and decision making regarding the master teacher proposals. There already is considerable talk, but that talk, in many cases, appears to have had little impact upon adopted plans. And there is very little evidence of broad-based decision making that involves all or most concerned and/or affected parties. The adversarial positions between policy makers and teachers (embodied in some teacher organization statements) are and will continue to be deterrents to progress, roadblocks in the way of reform. This recommendation, if acted upon, would lengthen the planning and initial implementation process but would also strengthen the plans and programs from both practical and "ownership" points of view.

2. Resist the temptation to root all programs and all program components in existing effective teaching or effective schools research. Although those bodies of knowledge are more robust than they were a decade ago, they are still not strong enough to stand the weight of major school organization reforms. Instead, use the research findings appropriately with the clear understanding that some findings are simply not suited to certain subject areas, student populations, or school levels. Bolster the research findings with values, beliefs, and craft knowledge. In other words, where there is no predictable certainty, depend upon what can be widely believed to be good teaching practice. This integration of research, belief, and craft knowledge will take time and energy in that it must be publicly formulated and must

receive substantial constituent validation to be an effective driving force behind a master teacher proposal.

3. Act upon system constraints prior to and concurrent with implementation of a master teacher program. The content of this paper is only the tip of the iceberg when it comes to describing the elements of the educational enterprise that can impede educational reform. To ignore these impediments is to court disaster. Our shared knowledge about how schools do or don't work is strong enough to direct our efforts toward making schooling compatible with the reforms we envision as making schools and teachers more effective. We have this knowledge available. We must use it.

4. Allocate and make available the necessary fiscal and human support during planning, implementation, assessment, and revision stages of master teacher program development. It is unfortunate but true that good ideas (and some not so good ideas) founder on the shoals of inadequate support. To deal effectively with a concept as dramatically different from "business as usual" as the master teacher concept, those concerned must be given the material and human resources to do a thorough and thoughtful piece of work. If, for instance, school officials did nothing but analyze their own system's institutional regularities as a way to discover the prospects and problems a master teacher program might encounter, the energy and time expended would be considerable. But, in like activities, the investment of this energy and time has been shown to be of considerable benefit.

In many ways, the master teacher concept is a given, despite the lack of clarity regarding what it is, how it can be differently defined, and what effects it may have on schools and the people in them. If this is true or partly true, it is incumbent on those concerned with and about teachers and schools to act in the best interests of teaching and learning situations

rather than stand idly by as largely political decisions influence the important activities that can and do take place in "a place called school" (Goodlad, 1983).

References

Adler, M. E. J. (1982). The Paideia proposal. New York: Macmillan Company.

Barnes, S. (1981). Synthesis of selected research on teaching findings (Rep. No. 9009). Austin, Tx: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Berliner, D. C., & Koehler, V. (1983). Introduction. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 261-263.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Cordes, C. (1983). Research finds little merit in merit pay. Monitor, 14.

Courter, L., & Ward, B. A. (1983). Staff development for school improvement. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), Staff development. Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edwards, S. (1984, April). An investigation of local implementation of teacher induction programs in two states. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Etzioni, A. (Ed.). (1969). The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers. New York: The Free Press.

Gardner, D. P. (Chair). (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Good, T. L. (1981). Classroom research: What we know and what we need to know (Rep. No. 9018). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Goodlad, J. I. (1983). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.

Goodlad, J. I., & Klein, M. F. (1974). Looking behind the classroom door (rev. ed.). Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones.

Griffin, G. A. (1983). Student teaching and the commonplaces of schooling (Rep. No. 9038). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Griffin, G. A. (Ed.). (1983). Staff development. Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Griffin, G. A., Barnes, S., O'Neal, S., Edwards, S., Defino, M., & Hukill, H. (1983). Changing teacher practice: Final report of an experimental study (Rep. No. 9052). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Griffin, G. A., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., O'Neal, S., Edwards, S., & Defino, M. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study (Rep. No. 9025). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Griffin, G. A., & Schlechty, P. (1983). Recommendations regarding certification of teachers. Paper prepared for the Mississippi State Department of Education. Unpublished manuscript.

Hacker, A. (1984, April). The schools flunk out. The New York Review of Books, 35-40.

Lanier, J. E. (1983). Tensions in teaching teachers the skills of pedagogy. In G. A. Griffin, Staff development. Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (Eds.). (1979). Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press.

Miles, M., & Schmuck, R. (1971). Improving schools through organization development. New York: Basic Books.

National Education Association. (1983, June). Statement by the National Education Association on excellence in education. Paper presented to the House Budget Committee Task Force on Education and Employment, Washington, DC.

Sarason, S. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Soar, R. S., & Soar, R. M. (1983). Context effects in the teaching-learning process. In D. C. Smith (Ed.), Essential knowledge for beginning educators. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Teacher Center Interactive Research and Development on Schooling Team. (1982). What are the factors which enable some teachers to maintain positive attitudes about their jobs? New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Ward, B. A. (1983, November). Effective schools: A respons to the educational proposals of 1983. Paper presented to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Conference National Education Association, Washington, DC.

Williams, R. C. (1982). Changing teacher behaviors: From symbolism to reality. In M. E. Defino & H. Carter (Eds.), Changing teacher practices: Proceedings of a national conference (Rep. No. 9017). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND THE CONCEPT OF MASTER TEACHER

Walter Doyle

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Mastery in any endeavor is an ambiguous label that represents some combination of skill, local customs and tastes, personal magnetism, and political savvy. Who are the best physicians, lawyers, architects, athletes, counselors, clergy? Are the best known necessarily the best? How many are there? Where does one draw the line between master and novice? This ambiguity is especially severe when an endeavor lacks clear outcomes or commonly accepted forms and procedures. Mastery is also a temporary status. Today's master painters may well be yesterday's or tomorrow's hacks. This year's championship team may not even qualify for the finals next year. It is not surprising, then, that considerable heat can be generated by a scheme to designate a finite number of teachers as "masters."

Problematic as the concept is, most states are pushing forward with plans to create the rank of master teacher in our school systems and research on teaching is often seen as a valuable resource for defining criteria of mastery. My task in this paper is to examine issues related to using recent findings from research on teaching as a knowledge base for making decisions about teacher mastery. The analysis begins with the concept of "master teacher" and the central meaning carried by this term. Attention then turns to the broad purposes of recent classroom studies of teaching and the nature of the information these studies have provided. The discussion ends with a consideration of problems and issues in using research on teaching in master teacher programs and possible ways in which

this knowledge base can be a resource for improving the quality of schooling.

The Concept of Master Teacher

The use of research as a resource for identifying master teachers presupposes that the definitions of effectiveness investigators use are congruent with the concept of mastery which underlies state and local programs. In this section the grounds for this presupposition are examined.

Teaching as effective practice. The easiest way to define a master teacher is to use the traditional criteria of education and experience: e.g., a master teacher is one who has earned a Master's degree and taught for five years. There are certain advantages to this stance since the criteria are clear and access to the status of master is open to anyone who is willing to endure coursework and classrooms. But the current movement has rejected this simple model in favor of a more direct assessment of a teacher's classroom performance. To be a master a teacher must at least be an effective classroom practitioner.

An emphasis on effective practice is reasonable but not necessarily easy. The question of effectiveness--who are the best teachers or what is the best way to teach--has occupied the attention of educational researchers for the better part of this century and answers to this question have often eluded our conceptual and empirical nets. Indeed, until recently, the search for criteria of effectiveness was largely disappointing.

Probably the most common approach to answering the effectiveness question is to derive a model of teaching practice from a basic discipline such as psychology or philosophy. Nuthall and Snook (1973) have identified three broad classes of teaching models: (a) a behavior control model based on laboratory studies of learning by Skinner and others; (b) a

discovery-learning model based on the cognitive theories of Bruner and others; and (c) a rational model derived from philosophically oriented analysis of cognition and learning. Joyce and Weil (1972) catalogued 16 models of teaching ranging from social interaction models of Thelen, Massialas and Cox, and the National Training Laboratories; information processing models of Bruner, Ausubel and Piaget; therapeutic models of Rogers, Glasser and Schutz; to the behavior modification models of Skinner. An alternative list of models has been developed by Easley (1977). From the perspective of model builders, an effective teacher is one who enacts a preferred model adequately.

In many cases there is little direct evidence that these models are actually effective in classrooms. Rather, validity is claimed on grounds of the basic knowledge used to construct the models in the first place and on strongly held beliefs about the intrinsic properties of educative experiences. Classroom research has generally indicated that it is difficult to validate such derivative models and "commitments" (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974). Nevertheless, these models demonstrate the range of competing and often conflicting understandings of the teaching process and the forms it should take. These competing models often harbor strong feelings that leap to the surface when judgments are made about merit and mastery.

Programmatic classroom research on the relationship between teaching variables and outcomes began in the 1920's with the work of A. S. Barr (1929) and has continued with remarkable vigor ever since (see Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Good, 1983). Most studies in this tradition have used one of two categories of teaching variables: (a) personal qualities of teacher, such as attitudes, intelligence, preparation, academic achievement, or

personality dimensions; or (b) aspects of classroom performance measured by either high-inference rating scales (e.g., clarity, enthusiasm, warmth) or low-inference behavior categories (e.g., frequency of praise statements, number of product questions). Outcomes in teaching effectiveness studies have been measured either by subjective ratings from principals or supervisors or by objective tests of student achievement or attitudes.

Contemporary research on effective teaching has generally used a process-product paradigm (see Doyle, 1977). According to this paradigm, an adequate study of effectiveness must relate measures of classroom performance (processes) to objective measures of outcomes (products). Once processes and products have been measured for a sample of classrooms, two steps are necessary to generate process-product relationships. First, classes are ranked on the basis of mean achievement adjusted for initial differences in entering ability. Second, differences in teaching processes among ranked classes are identified. In other words, process-product research is an attempt to "explain" between-class differences in achievement in terms of differences in teaching processes. The result of this kind of analysis is a list of classroom conditions or characteristics (i.e., teaching process measures aggregated across observations) that correlate with mean achievement for a class at the end of a school term.

A straight line application of this paradigm to a master teacher program often leads to a conception of the master teacher as one who fits the profile of effectiveness, i.e., who enacts the behaviors that have been shown to be reliably associated with student achievement. The problems associated with this "fit-the-profile" model of mastery in teaching are discussed shortly. But first, attention must be given to an additional

dimension of teacher competence that is often included in current master teacher schemes.

What Does Classroom Research Tell Us?

The recent record of accomplishment in effectiveness research is encouraging, if not definitive. We now know considerably more about the classroom conditions that promote student achievement than we did a decade ago (see Brophy, 1979; Good, 1983; Rosenshine, 1983). In very general terms, we have learned that effective teachers (at least for basic skills in elementary grades) are direct: They establish a clear focus on academic goals, are careful and explicit in structuring activities and directing students in how to accomplish assigned work, promote high levels of student academic involvement and content coverage, furnish opportunities for controlled practice with feedback, hold students accountable for work, and have expectations that they will be successful in helping students learn. Effective teachers are also active in explaining concepts and procedures, promoting meaning and purpose for academic work, and monitoring comprehension and misunderstanding.

The clear sense of the findings from classroom research is that effective teachers are able to establish and maintain high quality opportunities for students to engage meaningfully with content in classrooms. But we are also learning that (a) the problems associated with achieving this ideal vary with specific conditions, such as lesson content, objectives, composition of the classroom group, and time of year (see Good, 1983): and (b) directness and active promotion of meaning and understanding can take quite different forms depending upon social, cultural, and local circumstances (see Au, 1980; Erickson & Mohatt, 1982). Indeed, the more we study classrooms the more complex the picture of teaching in these settings

becomes. Increasing emphasis, therefore, has been placed on variations in educative forms and on decision-making and adaptation as central components of expertise in teaching. And programs of research are being launched to learn more about how teaching effects occur, i.e., about the processes that connect teaching events to outcomes, and about how the conditions of effectiveness are established and held in place in such complex environments as classrooms (see Doyle, 1984; Doyle, Sanford, Clements, French, & Emmer, 1983).

How Good is the Warranty?

The available findings concerning effective classroom teaching represent real advances in the field. But when does the application of these findings violate the warranty? Can these findings be used directly to make decisions about the mastery of individual teachers?

Teaching effectiveness researchers have always been uneasy about having findings from their studies used as criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of individual teachers (see Brophy, 1979; Good, 1983). This uneasiness is reasonable on several grounds. Results of classroom studies represent averages for groups of more and less effective teachers and differences are often best framed as tendencies or trends rather than sharp dichotomies. Moreover, as Good (1983, pp. 137-138) points out with reference to field experiments that tested outcomes of effective teaching research, "some of the control teachers in our studies have obtained high levels of student achievement using instructional systems that differ from those presented in the program we have developed." That is, we consistently find variations in the ways teachers accomplish effectiveness and not all effective teachers "fit the profile" defined by the general trends in effectiveness research. Finally, the empirical (and often the conceptual)

nets have been narrow. Research has focused primarily on the learning of basic skills by disadvantaged students in elementary grades. A great deal more needs to be learned about effective teaching for other students at other grade levels in other content domains such as writing, mathematical problem-solving, and scientific reasoning.

This analysis suggests that some excellent teachers will be missed if the present body of knowledge about effective teaching is used as a profile to select master teachers. It is also possible to have false positives, i.e., teachers who fit the profile but are not really effective in producing excellence. This problem is especially serious when management indicators are the primary basis of decisions. It is quite possible to have a well-turned lesson characterized by high work involvement and student productivity but low level task demands, little meaningfulness in the work, and low achievement (see Doyle, 1984).

It is also important to note that most contemporary studies of effective teaching were not designed to identify criteria for selecting teachers. The purpose, rather, was to generate knowledge about classroom conditions associated with achievement so that all teachers could improve their practice. The emphasis, in other words, was on teacher education rather than teacher selection. As Darling-Hammond and her colleagues (1983) have recently argued, the production of generalizable and context-free criteria for making job status decisions is a quite different process from the production of context-specific knowledge useful for helping teachers to understand classrooms and design more effective ways of arranging resources for increasing achievement.

In addition, it is not altogether clear that the effective teachers in classroom studies were, in fact, "master teachers," at least in the sense

that they represented absolute standards of teaching excellence. It is perhaps more accurate to say that they were relatively more effective than their colleagues in a particular sample. Whether the more effective teachers across studies represent a heterogeneous or homogeneous group has never been determined. In other words, could Brophy's teachers have out-taught Good's teachers?

The central point for our discussion here is that relatively small variations in the classroom performance of individual teachers cannot be attributed solely to variations in teacher competence. Teachers make a difference but not all differences are teacher effects. Situational and interactional factors play a role in shaping what happens in a classroom. It is reasonable to say that findings from effectiveness studies would enable someone to select from a population of teachers those who are likely to be effective under given circumstances. But it is considerably more risky to claim that only effective teachers would be selected or that all of the effective teachers in the population would be chosen. Available measures are simply not precise enough to allow confidence in these latter judgments. Unfortunately, master teacher schemes rest heavily on these claims.

Problems of Application

This examination of problems associated with using effectiveness research to make decisions about the abilities of individual teachers is not intended to suggest that nothing has been learned about what constitutes mastery in teaching. It should be construed, rather, as a warning that data of this nature gathered under these conditions must be used cautiously and imaginatively to improve the quality of classroom practice. Simplistic

applications -- e.g., more time on tasks that aren't educative -- can hardly be expected to improve the quality of schooling.

From the perspective outlined in this paper, research relates to practice not as a source of prescriptions or as a blueprint for all teachers to follow under all circumstances. Rather, research results define a continually growing knowledge base for interpreting classroom events and constructing situationally appropriate ways of managing learning opportunities. In the end, a master teacher is one who is consistently able to design tasks that accurately carry the curriculum to students and to orchestrate these tasks with students in the complex environments of classrooms. Effective teaching, then, is more than modeling the master teacher. It consists, rather, of the constructive adaptation of social and curriculum structures to specific contexts.

Such a conception of excellence in teaching suggest that mastery rests within the knowledge base accessible to all practitioners rather than in the magic qualities of a few wonderful teachers. It also suggests that identifying mastery is a task involving a full complement of professional knowledge and judgment rather than a simple application of a few discrete indicators. In the end, we may find that it is more fruitful to diffuse this knowledge throughout the profession than singling out only a few teachers for special status.

References

Au, K. H. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11, 91-115.

Barr, A. S. (1929). Characteristic differences in the teaching performance of good and poor teachers of the social studies. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Brophy, J. E. (1979). Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 733-750.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53, 285-328.

Doyle, W. (1977). Paradigms for research on teacher effectiveness. In L. S. Shulman (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. 5). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Doyle, W. (1984). How is order achieved in classrooms: An interim report. Journal of Curriculum Studies.

Doyle, W., Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., French, B., & Emmer, E. T. (1983). Managing academic tasks: Interim report of the junior high school study (R&D Rep. 6186). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Dunkin, M., Biddle, B. (1974). The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.

Easley, J. A. (1977). Seven modeling perspectives on teaching and learning: Some interrelations and cognitive effects. Instructional Science, 6, 319-367.

Erickson, F., & Mohatt, G. (1982). Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. In G. Spindler (Ed.), Doing the ethnography of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Good, T. L. (1983). Classroom research: A decade of progress. Educational Psychologist, 18, 127-144.

Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (1972). Models of teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Nuthall, G., & Snook, I. (1973). Contemporary models of teaching. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. Elementary School Journal, 83, 335-351.

THE MASTER TEACHER AS CURRICULUM LEADER

M. Frances Klein

University of Southern California

The master teacher concept is receiving considerable attention in the media and in educational circles today. Its advantages and disadvantages, whether the concept should be tied to merit pay, the definition of what master is to mean, who should be a master teacher, how he or she is to be selected, whether the unions will be involved in the selection and definition of the role, and what a master teacher will be selected to do are important aspects about the concept of master teacher which are receiving attention. They are, indeed, important aspects which deserve careful consideration, but the discussion in this paper does not debate the desirability or feasibility of the concept. The master concept is viewed as a way for improving the education of young people and the careers of outstanding teachers and is therefore desirable. It also assumes that the master teacher concept will become a reality; that it is a concept whose time has come. Given that pressures both from the lay public and within the education profession itself are operating to assure that the master teacher concept will become a widespread reality, how should the concept get defined to best help the education of young people and those who choose education as a career? That is the question which this paper attempts to answer.

Undoubtedly, the master teacher concept will evolve over time. There are various definitions of it now and there will be more developed in the future. Details of such a position will change over time, but a very significant way in which the position could be defined is to have the master teacher serve as a curriculum leader within a school. Such a definition of the role assumes that the concept will be selectively applied; that is, only

those teachers who have special qualifications will hold the position of master teacher. A teacher will qualify as a master teacher only after being a very successful career teacher and after expressing interest in further developing his or her professional skills. Most schools will have only a few master teachers, but those master teachers will receive public recognition of their unusual skill as a classroom teacher and their potential success as a curriculum leader.

Importance of Curriculum Leaders

The importance of the curriculum to the schooling process is clearly recognized. Curriculum is the substance of schooling and as such deserves sustained, skillful attention at the local school level. Although the school principal may be expected to be the instructional leader of the school, there is more work which must be done at the school level than can be expected of even a very skilled administrator in curriculum. Curriculum leadership tasks for curriculum improvement are diverse and numerous. A single administrator cannot be expected to be skilled in all of them nor have the time to engage extensively in many of them. An administrator committed to the importance to curriculum would find much more realization of curriculum improvement when supported by a skilled competent, master teacher who is also a curriculum leader.

The need for curriculum improvement at the classroom level has been documented in recent research. Repetitiveness, lack of involvement in school work, flatness of the learning climate, an almost exclusive use of lecture-recitation as the way to teacher and learn, and barren classrooms devoid of learning resources is the picture painted from some research (Goodlad, 1984). Young students surely deserve much better than this. Yet, many attempts in the past to improve curricula have not been perceived as

very successful. Curriculum improvement, as an aspect of school improvement, must occur at the local school level. Only as classroom practices improve will significant curriculum change have occurred. A curriculum leader based at the local school and who possesses knowledge of and skills in curriculum development could do much to improve the curriculum offered to and experienced by the students. The master teacher with a firm footing in classroom practice and with qualifications in curriculum development would be in a unique position to offer such leadership. The remainder of this paper identifies the needed qualifications which a master teacher should have to function as a curriculum leader.

Qualifications for the Master Teacher as Curriculum Leader

As a minimum qualification the master teacher should possess the skills and attributes expected of any good career teacher. As an example, the current research on effective teachers defines only a small part, yet an essential part, of the skills needed in educating young people. As Professor Doyle has indicated, however, the effective teacher research helps define only the minimum skills which all teachers ought to have. (See article in this issue.) The master teacher must possess these, plus more. What, then, must a master teacher have which would be well beyond the minimal skills?

Curriculum development is the major area in which master teachers must possess greater knowledge, qualities, and skills which clearly differentiate them from other career teachers. All teachers must be well educated, competent professionals; but the master teacher must also excel in abilities related to developing comprehensive educational programs and in implementing them as successful classroom practices. There are seven different attributes which a master teacher as curriculum leader ought to possess to a

degree well beyond that which might be expected of all teachers. The seven attributes are: 1) has a broad perspective on the variety of functions and goals which schools are expected to help students develop; 2) possesses extensive abilities in curriculum development; 3) is an active inquirer into the educative process; 4) continues his or her professional development; 5) holds a view of students as developing young people; 6) possesses the needed personal characteristics and skills; and, 7) knows himself or herself. In the discussion which follows, each of the seven identified attributes are briefly discussed and the implications for the master teachers as a curriculum leader are identified.

Perspective on the Variety of Functions and Goals

The master teacher must develop and maintain a view of schooling which keeps in focus the variety of educational outcomes to which schools are expected to contribute. In spite of the current emphasis upon the basic skills, there is evidence that at least in some schools, parents, teachers, and students hold expectations for schooling that go well beyond "the basics" (Goodlad, 1984). In addition to a strong emphasis in the intellectual domain (which includes the basics), they also expect the schools to help students attain goals in the personal, social, and vocational domain. Further, there is some evidence that teachers and students believe their school are, indeed, helping them attain a variety of goals (Frymier, et al., 1984).

There is other evidence that schools are expected to contribute broadly to a student's education. Goal statements in curriculum guides from any state department and any district curriculum always identify a variety of educational outcomes and parents, teachers, and students naturally expect the school to meet these diverse outcomes. The lay public must be helped to

understand how the schools have the opportunity to do much more than just teach the basics. To define the mission of a school in terms of only developing basic skills (or any other single outcome) is to condemn schools to mediocrity and to ignore their power to contribute to other equally important educational goals. The master teacher must know and always keep in view the wide array of goals for schooling.

Not only must the master teacher possess a broad view of the goals of schooling, he or she must consistently and effectively remind other educators and the lay public that schools can and must do more for students than just help them develop the basic skills. In times of over-reaction and a retreat to a narrow definition of what schooling can do, the master teacher must be a leader in reminding everyone of what else schools actually do and what else they could potentially do in educating students.

Extensive Abilities in Curriculum Development

In order to translate a comprehensive array of goals for schooling into classroom practices, the master teacher must have extensive abilities in curriculum and instruction. A narrow view of what curriculum is and how teaching is to occur will impede the development of classroom activities designed to help students grow and develop in a variety of desired ways. The master teacher must know and have the abilities to provide classroom activities based upon differing conceptions of curriculum such as Eisner and Vallance (1974) have identified. To only view the curriculum as an academic rationalist as Adler (1982) and others do, for example, is to diminish the potential power of schools, to unnecessarily restrict the learning of students, and to ignore other expected outcomes of the curriculum. As another example, the development of cognitive processes must not be restricted to the academic disciplines. Students must be helped to think

critically about the social world around them and their own lives so that both can be improved. Also, students must be given opportunities to develop their own unique potential and special abilities. To best achieve these outcomes require classroom practices based upon differing conceptions of curriculum. The master teacher must not be seduced into thinking that one exclusive view is the "right" conception of curriculum. Multiple conceptions of what curriculum can be must guide the development of the practical activities by the master teacher. A single conception narrows the range of educational outcomes to be fostered. Curricula must be based upon and designed for different premises so that classroom practices are developed to help students achieve a variety of outcomes. Similarly, direct instruction must be augmented by other families and models of teaching. Joyce and Weil (1980), for example, have suggested a broad array of teaching models which a master teacher must have in his or her repertoire of professional skills. To have less than a complement of skills in teaching is to restrict the curriculum as severely as operating under the umbrella of only one conception of curriculum.

The full array of goals desired by many for the school to accomplish requires alternative views of the curriculum and the essential skills in curriculum development to plan and implement diverse practices in the classroom. Without these skills, the curriculum will be severely limited and imbalanced.

Another skill in curriculum development must be the ability to plan within several different time frames. The broad, overall curriculum plan for a school must have a clear design (composed, of several curriculum designs) so that as students progress through the school, they encounter a unified, comprehensive, integrated set of learning opportunities. This

requires planning on a long-term basis. The curriculum of a classroom must similarly be cohesive and integrated. Unites must be developed which may last for several weeks or months--another time frame for planning. Finally, daily lessons must be developed which have a coherence to the rest of the curriculum at all the various levels of planning. Curriculum is not merely an accumulation of separate, albeith well-planned lessons. It must have overarching concepts and organization to tie lessons together in a meaningful way. The master teacher could carry the primary responsibility for the necessary planning and organization of curricula within the varying time frames. At some point, of course, administrators, parents, and particularly, students also must be involved in such curriculum planning, but the master teacher would be the key person.

The foregoing skills in curriculum development define a different role for the master teacher than teachers have now. Teachers currently function primarily as curriculum users. Most classroom teachers have limited meaningful involvement in curriculum development and few have the necessary skills for engaging in the curriculum development tasks. This undoubtedly contributes in a significant way to the impoverished curricula which have been documented in the schools. To improve curricula in any significant way means developing and adapting curricula at the local level--the school level--and that could be helped significantly by having master teachers function as curriculum leaders skilled in all the necessary tasks involved in curriculum development.

Skills in curriculum development such as in the two areas discussed are essential in defining the master teacher as a technical leader in curriculum development. The two areas of skills; having a broad perspective upon curriculum and possessing extensive skills in curriculum planning and

implementation; however, must be accompanied by other necessary attributes of the master teacher. The other needed attributes may appear to be less directly related to curriculum development, but in fact are significantly related to being a curriculum leader.

Active Inquirer into the Educative Process

Although extensive research skills would not be necessary, the master teacher must be curious about and eager to improve the educative process and in particular, schooling. A belief that the status quo is the best that can occur or that how things are being done now is the best or only way to help students learn must be rejected by the master teacher. The ability to ask significant questions about what, how, and why practices are occurring in schooling; to collect evidence to be used in answering such questions; to search for alternative concepts and procedures; and most importantly, to be willing to experiment with hunches, ideas, and alternatives to current classroom practices would be essential attributes of an active inquirer. Old notions about action research and team leaders and newer ones about interactive teaching and master teachers might be combined to help create a master teacher who is truly a professional; who is actively involved in solving problems associated with schooling; who consistently inquires into schooling; and who is committed to the improvement of schooling.

This clearly will require an understanding of the process of change and the personal stability not to be threatened by changed. To inquire into the educative process means to improve it; and to improve it means to change practices. Knowledge of how change occurs and skills in managing the change process, then, also must be a part of the professional development of the master teacher.

Continued Professional Development

A master teacher must be characterized by continual growth in the what, how, and why of daily activities in the classroom. Membership and involvement in professional organizations, attendance at conferences and meetings, involvement in staff development programs, advanced university work, and interactions with other teachers are all ways which the master teacher would use for fostering growth. These activities, combined with the role of active inquirer, assure that the master teacher will be current in the education profession--even on the cutting edge of it.

It is essential that the master teacher be supported by the system in his or her continued growth. Time for reflective thought, administrative support for change, freedom to try new ideas, and opportunities to work effectively in groups and with individual teachers must accompany the personal quest for continued professional development. The impact of the master teacher will be dramatically reduced unless the system supports and adapts to the new ideas being pursued through the avenues of professional development.

New ideas and new ways of doing things which will improve the education of students must be actively sought--not passively received--through professional development. The focus of the master teacher in the continuous process of growth should always be upon the improvement of curriculum and instruction through classroom activities.

Students as Developing Young People

A knowledge of how children and young people grow and develop is an essential aspect of developing curriculum. This knowledge would include the inherent developmental characteristics of young people in general within the age ranges of those who attend the school, and the particular

characteristics of the students in the school. A well-planned curriculum consists of more than content, processes, and skills to be taught; it consists, too, of planned interactions of students with the content. It also consists of a carefully constructed environment designed to challenge students to explore and investigate for themselves. Without extensive understanding of young people in general and of the specific students within the school, curriculum and instruction will be composed of sterile ideas or processes which never will become a part of the student. In planning curricula, neither content nor an understanding of how people grow and develop can be neglected.

The master teacher must view students in yet another role--that of being an individual and unique human being. Interactions with the master teacher should enable the student to transcend the role of student into becoming a unique, respected, total person. Interactions with young people beyond the role of a student must be encouraged and valued. The master teacher's personal contact with students as human beings is as important an avenue for teaching and learning as the formal contact with them as students. The master teacher must always respond to the attempts of students to reach out to teachers as people beyond the confines of the classroom and help other teachers to recognize and respond to these attempts. That is, the master teacher must model for all teachers the importance of knowing students as unique human beings.

Through personal contacts, many significant and long lasting messages are implicitly transmitted to students. Through personal contacts, the master teacher uses the informal, the implicit, the hidden, or the covert curriculum to teach as deliberately and positively as the formal, explicit, or overt curriculum is used. What is done to and with students must be

considered as important as the content being taught, since both help determine what is learned. Acceptance and encouragement of young people as total individuals, not just exclusively as students, must be an essential characteristic of a master teacher.

Needed Personal Characteristics and Skills

In order to be an effective leader, the master teacher must possess personal attributes which are admired by students and other teachers. Among these would be a sense of humor, openness, trustworthiness, honesty, emotional maturity, warmth, and respect for others. These attributes would enable the master teacher to relate well to others and to function as a model of a "good" human being.

In addition to the above personal attributes, there are explicitly learned skills which the master teacher must possess. Interpersonal skills essential to effective communication and the every-present committee work so necessary in curriculum development must be evident. The ability to read implicit messages as well as to hear explicit messages would need to be developed. To anticipate personal impact upon others would be an important skill to a leader. There are examples of the important learned skills which a master teacher must possess.

Overarching both the personal attributes and the skills to be explicitly developed would be a well-developed sense of responsibility to the profession and to the people involved in and served by it. A code of ethics as a professional educator would be carefully followed and clearly in evidence.

Personal characteristics and skills such as those discussed above will enable the master teacher to function effectively as a curriculum leader. He or she will serve as a model of desired human attributes to which it is

hoped the curriculum will somehow contribute. The master teacher, as a living example of a "good" human being, could help in portraying very powerfully a role model which students and other teachers could emulate.

Knows himself or Herself

Within the recent years, the hidden, covert, or implicit curriculum has become recognized as a powerful source of learnings. Through the implicit curriculum, the student learns things about which educators have been naively unaware. The implicit curriculum must become as explicit as possible so that the unintended messages students receive become the direct, intended learnings desired. To make the implicit curriculum more of a tool of deliberate learning, teachers must have knowledge of themselves as people--their values, idiosyncracies, faults, strengths, and desires. It is through such human characteristics that much of the implicit curriculum is taught. The personal knowledge of himself or herself as a teacher, leader, and as a human being will enable the master teacher to better monitor the impact he or she has upon students. Possessing this knowledge of himself or herself, the master teacher can function as a leader to help other teachers use knowledge of self as a way to improve and strengthen the learnings from implicit curriculum.

Conclusion

The concept of master teacher provides an opportunity to reconceptualize or extent the role of the teacher, at least in part. The master teacher would not be engaged in "keeping school as usual," but would be assuming new responsibilities in curriculum development which are directly related to the improvement of schooling. This paper has identified some areas which are important to the new role. The seven attributes of the master teacher as curriculum leader discussed above will have to be examined

over time to determine whether they do, indeed, have the impact expected of them. It is clear, however, that the master teacher could play a critical role in curriculum development. Improved local curricula with alternative designs and new concepts for classroom practices could be significant benefits from the leadership of the master teacher in curriculum development. These would result in the overall improvement of schooling.

The preceding discussion may sound like an ideal to be striven for, but some would not consider it as such. There are teachers who already exemplify much of what is proposed. Carefully selected master teachers who have each of the attributes discussed is well within the realm of possibility at the present time. Master teachers will need to be helped in learning about and developing their new roles, of course. A master teacher who can function as a curriculum leader will not occur overnight nor without some costs, but there exist now outstanding teachers who, with some help, could become master teachers in a short time.

Each of the attributes discussed represent a way in which master teachers could make a significant contribution to the improvement of schooling and each has implications that dare not be ignored. New ways of formal teacher education must be devised. New programs for staff development must be developed. Support from administrators and other teachers must be solicited. The lay public must be helped to understand and accept the master teacher concept. And undoubtedly, new action in support of the master teacher concept will be needed in the politics of schooling. The successful implementation of the master teacher concept will not occur without careful planning. The profession must be prepared to engage in a number of fronts simultaneously if the master teacher concept is to live up to its potential.

How the role of the master teacher is defined can have profound implications for the future of the education profession. The new role for a teacher who has already achieved a high degree of success must be addressed conceptually very carefully and nurtured in reality very systematically. Unless this is done, it may well take the form of other widely heralded innovations in education--eventual blunting upon the classroom door. Ideas such as the master teacher concept which offer great potential to the improvement of schooling must be the subject of careful development. The existence of a strong public school system may well depend upon it.

References

Adler, M. J. (1982). The Paidiea proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Macmillan.

Doyle, W. (Reference to be completed upon acceptance of this manuscript.)

Eisner, E. W., & Vallance, E. (1974). Conflicting conceptions of curriculum. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Frymier, J., Cornbleth, C., Donmayer, R., Gansneder, B. M., Jeter, J. T., Klein, M. F., Schwab, M., & Alexander, W. M. (1984). One hundred good schools. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (1980). Models of teaching, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

THE MASTER TEACHER CONCEPT: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Karen Kepler Zumwalt

Teachers College

Columbia University

Last July when I agreed to speak about implications of the master teacher concept* for teacher education, I assumed that by AERA there would be some further development of the concept and perhaps an evolving agreement about its meaning. Instead, over the past ten months there has been very little consideration of the concept outside of political rhetoric and hopeful legislative initiatives in some states. Beyond the basic idea that differentially rewarding teachers identified by some means as "master teachers" might help attract and keep good teachers in our schools, there seems to be a great diversity in what "master teacher" means and what it will look like in schools. Given the nature of our educational system, this diversity is legitimate and to be expected--it does make it terribly hard, however, to talk about implications of a concept which has a variety of evolving meanings and actual manifestations. Hence, considerations of implications have to take place at a very general level.

I would also like to be writing these comments on implications after hearing what Greene, Griffin, Doyle, and Klein have to say, since undoubtedly each paper will imply a rich agenda for teacher educators. I expect that their presentations will provide the serious consideration of the master teacher concept so absent in the last ten months. I suspect that they will move us away from the simplistic conceptions of master teachers

*I recognize that the label "master teacher" may be problematic, but it will be used here for convenience. It is the concept rather that the title which is being considered in terms of implications in this paper.

which often seem ignorant of the social system of schools, devoid of curriculum concerns, silent on the larger issues of what schools and teachers are and should be about, unaware that "good" teaching takes many forms and is context dependent, and overly optimistic that the theoretical, practical, research knowledge is available to identify and provide incentives to attract and keep the most competent people in teaching.

While it might be appropriate to conclude that it is too early to be talking about implications, I would not want to be guilty of taking a cautious, let's-wait-and-see attitude so often adopted by those of us sitting in academia, a little distant from the battlefield. If we as professional educators let the "master teacher" concept be defined by legislators and State Departments of Education we have to be willing to accept the fact that there may be changes which are not informed by theory, research, or practical knowledge in a way in which we feel comfortable, or that the moment of public interest will soon pass as it becomes clear that the "master teacher" solution is not the hoped for panacea. Because I think the "master teacher" concept does touch upon a central dilemma of the teaching profession and because the public appears somewhat receptive to alternative solutions at this point, I believe the major implication for teacher educators is to get themselves involved in the present dialogue. "Waiting-and-seeing" may not be just a missed opportunity, but may permit changes which challenge our present central position in the preparation and development of the teaching profession.

If Harry Judge's (1982) analysis of the dilemmas facing Graduate Schools of Education is correct, then this suggestion of getting involved in the current public debate is more of a challenge than it might seem on the surface, particularly for teacher educators associated with graduate

institutions. Judge finds GSE's unsure of whether they want to be part of a graduate school of arts and sciences or a professional school.

> By deliberate choice, they have tended to distance themselves from both the task of training teachers for elementary and secondary schools and that of addressing the problems and needs of those schools (p. 6).

Judge believes that these efforts to distance themselves from teachers and schools are related to the low status of teachers in the country (low in the eyes of their university colleagues as well as to the critical general public) and to the messiness and difficulties involved in actually trying to work in schools (Zumwalt, 1983). Undoubtedly, many of us here today are familiar with the internal pressures within our own research-oriented institutions which lead us to seek rewards in scholarship, often quite isolated from the real world of schools, teachers and children.

Yet even when we do want to make the commitment to schools and teachers, it is not so easy to know how to enter the public dialogue. We have learned how to participate in academic dialogue for our own professional survival; entering the public dialogue in an effective manner may be more difficult. Just recently several colleagues, including Maxine Greene and myself, presented our reactions to the series of seemingly unending reports on education to the Board of Trustees of Teachers College. Our efforts were much appreciated by this largely "lay" audience, but they threw the critical challenge back to us: how do we get the faculty and the institution involved in the public dialogue. Courses, conferences, workshops, speeches, publications--our standard responses--they felt were not enough. The time-consuming, often unrewarded work of involving ourselves directly in these issues at the local and state levels seems to be demanded. The "master teacher" concept provides a concrete entry point into this public dialogue for those of us who have been involved in teaching

about, studying and facilitating the professional development of teachers. Hopefully, as professional educators we will seize this opportunity rather than relegate it to our evergrowing "when-I-have-the-time-to-do" list.

In the remainder of this paper, I would like to speculate on some of the contributions we might make to the public dialogue and some of the changes which might ensue for our own teacher education programs if the "master teacher" idea becomes a reality on a widespread basis. I will conclude the paper advocating a particular stance about the substance of some of these changes based on a deliberative view of teaching.

Our initial contributions in the present public dialogue are well represented by today's panel members. Greene, Griffin, Doyle, and Klein are critically addressing the basic theoretical and practical questions about meaning, context, knowledge bases, identification, implementation, and consequences which have understandably been absent in the public dialogue. Besides raising issues, teacher educators should help to conceptualize the task, pursue the suggested research agendas, involve ourselves in the practical tasks of writing legislation and helping local school districts experiment with different approaches, agree to serve on outside "evaluation" teams, and provide convincing arguments for higher education continued involvement in the preparation and continuing professional development of teachers. In other words, we have to leave our after-the-fact arm chair critic role and help inform this evolving idea of master teacher. It is unlikely that we will lose our valued academic perspective by making this foray into the public arena--more likely we will help inform the dialogue and be informed by the process ourselves. Even more pragmatically, in some cases, we may be saving our jobs by helping to ensure a future role for university-based teacher educators and schools of education.

In considering possible programmatic implications of the master teacher concept, it is first necessary to briefly describe what a "master teacher" might entail. For the purposes of this paper, we will not consider programmatic implications of "master teacher" plans which are essentially merit pay plans in disguise. These are plans where teachers are given monetary rewards based on factors such as attendance, student achievement, on-task behavior of students, masters degrees in subject areas, etc. These merit pay plans involve recognition of some desirable behavior, but do not involve a restructuring of the teaching profession--teaching remains a careerless profession with some possibility of relatively minor salary incentives for those who meet certain requirements. Programmatic implications for teacher educators are limited to making students aware of various criteria, facilitating achievement of criteria and/or avoidance of schools where criteria of merit run contrary to one's conception of good teaching. "Master teacher" plans, in contrast, are attempts to provide monetary and status incentives for teachers through establishment of career ladders for teachers or opportunities for differentiated responsibilities within the school. These plans are generally conceived at the state or local level, but could also be an integral part of a national service plan in which teaching would be an alternative for a select cadre of college graduates who aspire to become "master teachers."

While programmatic changes would be more profound if colleges and universities were to become integral components of a national service teacher development plan, I will focus on the changes engendered by the more likely state and local initiatives. The substance of the changes would be quite similar despite differences in form.

Preservice programs preparing prospective teachers to enter the profession at the lowest career ladder would still be devoted to imparting the usual knowledge, skills and attitudes considered essential for beginning teachers. Given the new nature of the profession, however, one would hope that more attention would be devoted to instilling within preservice students the self-analytic and reflective skills necessary for continued professional growth. Obviously, consideration of various criteria for advancement in the profession would be added, as well as attention to new stresses involved in constant evaluation and deciding whether one wanted to take advantage of offered opportunities. Given the new focus on evaluating teachers, hopefully, preservice programs would put aside their own survival concerns, and more conscientiously weed out prospective teachers who have little chance of making it through the probationary years.

In order to give their graduates a fair chance at competing for "master teacher" status, some institutions might decide to raise admission standards, prepare fewer students and switch focus to graduate preparation of teachers, requiring all students to have majored in a subject matter area as undergraduates. These masters level students, being more mature and having a stronger academic background, would probably be ready to benefit from a heavier emphasis on curriculum development--both theoretical and practical--and research on teaching than is presently available in most undergraduate preservice programs. These two critical areas of pedagogical knowledge, for some reason, seem to be reserved for graduate school presently. From my own experience, I know they can be incorporated into masters level preservice programs; I suspect that quality undergraduate programs can also impart both knowledge and skills involved in making teachers curriculum developers, and consumers and researchers of teaching.

Such active conceptions of teaching and teachers would help insure the kinds of attitudes toward professional growth which one would expect master teachers to exhibit.

The presence of career ladders/differentiated responsibilities for teachers would probably involve more widespread changes in our inservice graduate level programs than in preservice programs. Presently, except for the masters programs mandatory in some states for permanent certification and courses taken for salary increments or required continuing education, our graduate programs are generally geared for teachers taking the "escalator out of teaching" (Judge, 1982). This is an understandable phenomenon since one has to leave the classroom in most cases to advance professionally. All too often our inservice masters programs for teachers have been smorgasbords of course work rather than well thought out programs aimed at facilitating professional development in some systematic way. Presently, salary increment and continuing education course taking is increasingly in competition with alternative means of receiving "inservice" credit in one's own school district or through union sponsored courses and workshops. Some master teacher proposals continue this movement away from university-based courses and workshops. Hence, if graduate schools of education are to continue to play a significant role in inservice education, we must cooperate with state and local authorities in devising appropriate inservice experiences for teachers. The development of "master teacher" plans gives us the chance to help design these experiences in ways we feel will be professionally beneficial. To lose this opportunity may hasten our disappearance from the inservice market.

Programmatic implications, of course, will be dependent on what new roles teachers will assume. I suspect that alternatives might involve

classroom teachers more actively as curriculum developers, staff developers, supervisors, administrators, action researchers, subject matter or learner specialists, teacher educators, and School Board or community liaisons. And, hopefully, most proposals will include the option of allowing "master teachers" on a permanent or rotating basis to remain as full-time teachers. Their additional responsibilities might be to serve as demonstration teachers, to try out new curriculum or to serve in other capacities at times which would not interfere with their desire to remain as full-time teachers (i.e., during the summer months).

Being recognized as "master teacher," however, does not mean that teachers will be masters of the new roles without added preparation. Whatever the new roles and responsibilities expected of teachers, they should be able to find assistance and stimulation from those of us based in universities and colleges of education. While addressing the particular concerns facing teachers, we have the opportunity to make these experiences more than another set of hoops to pass through--to make them truly educative in a broader sense.

The form of these experiences--courses, workshops, independent study, internships, seminars--will most likely vary depending on state regulations, market conditions and arrangements worked out between universities and school districts. A diversity of arrangements is most likely. While some teachers might want to pursue the traditional degree path, I suspect that others will be more interested in seeking experiences directly tied into their career advancement. Perhaps some arrangement similar to the obtaining of an administrator's/supervisor's certificate will emerge. It might be a general certificate or one which indicates specialization in one of the several expanded roles teachers might take on as "master teachers." Lortie

(1983) has suggested that this outside credentialing might take away some of the resentment amongst a school staff when some are chosen as master teachers and others are not. As with the present administrative-supervisory certificate, teachers wishing consideration would decide to make this additional investment at the risk of never being able to use it. Lortie believes this would make selection as a master teacher less socially disruptive to the sometimes quite fragile social system existing in our schools. To tell you the truth, I'm not sure this arrangement will "sell in Peoria" unless we are able to convince legislators and school people that we do have something unique to offer and are willing to work in new collaborative ways with school districts.

In outlining what I feel is the major implication of critical involvement of teacher educators in master teacher plans and some general programmatic implications at the preservice and inservice levels, I have tried to speak in general terms applicable to teacher educators holding diverse views of teaching and teacher education. Having done so, I now want to look at the issue from my particular perspective as a teacher educator holding what Popkewitz (1982) has called a constructionist view toward curriculum and what I have called a deliberative orientation toward teaching (Zumwalt, 1982). Separating these comments from the general ones previously stated hopefully permits those who hold other views to consider the first part of the paper while dismissing the latter. Placing these comments at the end also permits me to switch to an advocacy role with less guilt, and highlight what I see as an increasingly overlooked perspective on what teaching should be about.

The master teacher proposal has been advocated as a way to attract and keep good people in teaching. Even if it were implemented on a widespread

scale with substantial financial incentives, it alone could not solve the problems of the flight of academically able students away from teaching nor the flight of competent, good teachers out of teaching. Let me illustrate the complexity of the problem by describing what I see as two countertrends to attracting and retaining able people in teaching. We as teacher educators should have some influence on both trends if we care to get involved. When so many of the factors contributing to our present crises are demographic and economic ones (e.g., the opening up of previously all male professions to educated women) over which we have minimal control, it seems especially important to address those factors over which we might have some control.

While changes in the structure of the teaching profession, such as those embodied in the "master teacher" proposal, are certainly worth pursuing, attention needs to go beyond career ladders and differentiated responsibilities to a consideration of the nature and quality of human interaction in our schools today. In too many schools, teachers are not getting the "3 R's" which a recent New York City Teacher Center Study (1983) found as critical to the maintenance of positive attitudes toward teaching. No, I'm not speaking of teachers' lack of basic skills, but the "respect, reinforcement and recognition" which is necessary for all but appears particularly salient for teachers in the '80's who are under attack from the outside world. Whether schools can provide teachers with the 3 R's will have much to do with whether deserving teachers will feel it is worth their effort to stay in teaching. But being dependent on so many human factors, the creation of this kind of positive environment may be more elusive than other more concrete structural changes.

While the major changes must come in the social climate of schools, we as teacher educators could do a better job of providing teachers with the 3 R's while they are students in our institutions and demonstrating our interest and respect for them by becoming involved with teachers in schools in a variety of collaborative ways which would be professionally satisfying. To paraphrase Judge, too often we as teacher educators are involved in helping students take the "escalator out of teaching" while trying to elevate ourselves from our professional school status by pursuing an arts and sciences model of acceptability. "Scholarship is valued above professionalism" concludes Judge (1982, p. 48). Our uneasiness with being professional schools rather than graduate schools of arts and sciences needs to be addressed. We need to make a clearer commitment based on mutual respect and problem-solving rather than one based on unidirectional delivery of expertise, research, criticism and solutions.

A related second illustration of present countertrends to the attraction and retention of good teachers comes from my own observations in schools and informal feedback from returning graduates. In an era when "direct instruction," "time on task," and teacher and school effectiveness defined by achievement test scores are currently popular, teachers are finding themselves thrust more and more into a technological orientation to their work rather than a deliberative orientation to teaching and a constructive orientation to curriculum. For example, in one suburban school district teachers are evaluated several times a year on the amount of "direct instruction" and "time on task" in the observed lesson--certainly a frustrating experience for teachers who hold a different conception of their role as teachers, and a particularly frustrating experience for the outside consultant who has been hired to encourage more "creative and critical

thinking." In an urban school, a veteran fourth grade teacher found herself faced with reading and math lessons scheduled for the entire year. She was not only told which objective (read workbook/textbook page) she was to achieve each day, but all her students were to be tested bimonthly to assess how they (and she) are doing. She not only finds the whole class, lock-step approach to curriculum for her bilingual fourth grade innercity class educationally unsound, but insulting to her professional judgment. While these may be extreme cases, there is definitely a technological thrust to solving educational problems. For good teachers who see teaching as demanding constant judgment about ends and means in a contextually complex setting and see themselves as curriculum makers rather than mere implementors, this present technological thrust adds to their self-doubts about entering or staying in the teaching profession. Academically able, creative, good teachers need to feel they are expected to do more than supervise workbook activities, cover the text, and prepare students for achievement tests. As a suburban superintendent recently commented at a BOCES seminar I was conducting, "as a profession we have so trivialized teaching" that we shouldn't be surprised that good people are leaving.

Added to this trivialization of teaching and recent restrictions on teacher autonomy is the assault of outside experts who come to schools with their formulas of what it takes to be an "effective teacher." It's not just misguided because there is no recipe for good teaching, but it is terribly demeaning for a competent professional to have to submit oneself to instruction which is remedial in nature and, often, in tone. There is a way experts and research can be useful to teachers and inform their practice--teachers are sensitive to these differences. But unfortunately, in too many cases, research is being used as another means of controlling

teachers--as a measure of remediation of perceived deficiencies which may be suitable for a few needy teachers, but is certainly not an appropriate way to deal with the large majority of professional teachers.

These two illustrations of workplace factors--an insufficient amount of 3 R's and a technological orientation to teaching which is redefining teaching and teachers' autonomy--are phenomena which run the risk of undermining efforts to attract and retain the best teachers in teaching. While the master teacher proposals speak directly to the "3 R's" issues, they also have the potential of perpetuating a technological perspective of teaching since there is a need to identify criteria for selection of master teachers.

Those with a technological view see teaching as composed of a definable repertoire of knowledge, skills and attitudes that a teacher brings to bear in an effort to create desired outcomes in learners. Identification of these knowledge, skills and attitudes then becomes the research agenda of teacher educators and provides a clear set of criteria to judge professional career advancement. This particular view of teaching is going to look more and more attractive to those seeking an easy way to identify and reward master teachers.

Elsewhere I have argued for a different view of teaching--what I call a deliberative orientation. (See Zumwalt, 1982). The process of teaching entails applying the basic tools of the trade--not just pedagogical knowledge and skills but one's experience, intuition and understanding of particular learners and content--in what is essentially a fast-paced, continuous, complex problem-solving and decision-making process. It involves deliberation about ends as well as means. The master teacher has a commitment to reflection and growth--is in essence a master

deliberator--about teaching, curriculum, management, organization and interpersonal relationships. There are probably an infinite variety of "good teachers" which evolve as individual teachers engage in deliberation within their particular context. With this particular viewpoint, as teacher educators working with either preservice or inservice teachers, our aim is the same--to help enhance teachers' deliberations about teaching. The knowledge, skills and attitudes identified by those with a technological orientation are important grist for the deliberative mill, but they must always be processed through the user's values, goals and consideration of contextual variables. The criteria for identification of master teachers cannot be directly derived from research, but instead must itself be the result of the process of deliberation--a process in which, hopefully, teacher educators will become involved.

I suspect, however, that we will have to sell the public first on this view of the nature of teaching. The complexities and messiness we see is not one which sits easily with a solution-oriented, technological society which has difficulties seeing the difference between increasing productivity at General Motors and improving the education of our children--all our children. We are also handicapped by the public's familiarity with schooling and their increasing sense of superiority to those who run and teach in our schools. The "answers" seem obvious to the public as well as to our President--more discipline, higher standards for students and teachers, more homework, longer school days, more required courses, merit pay for productive teachers. The simple logic of such remedies is very compelling, particularly for those who hold a factory metaphor of schooling. It is time for those of us who find this metaphor alien to our sense of education to speak louder and more compellingly--not just within the

confines of our professional walls but to the general public as well. In speaking compellingly we have a difficult task. We need to avoid succumbing to our own simplistic solutions, yet speak specifically enough so that our vision of education can be seen in concrete terms--what it means for children, teachers, schools and our society.

References

Judge, H. (1982). American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad. New York: A report to the Ford Foundation.

Lortie, D. (1983, November). Speech to Metropolitan School Study Council, New York, NY.

New York City Teachers Center Team. (1982). Teachers' positive attitudes toward their work. Report of Interactive Research and Development in Schools Project. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick, R., & Wehlage, G. (1982). The myth of educational reform: A study of school responses to a program of change. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Zumwalt, K. (1982). Research on Teaching: Policy implications for teacher education. In A. Liberman and M. McLaughlin (Eds.), Policy Making in Education, Eighty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.